

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE



Bulletin

Vol. XLV, No. 1150

July 10, 1961

SECRETARY RUSK'S NEWS CONFERENCE OF
JUNE 22 51

OUR CHANGING WORLD • *by Charles E. Bohlen* 62

A NEW GENERATION AND THE FUTURE OF AFRICA •
by Assistant Secretary Williams 72

A NEW BIRTH OF FREEDOM • *by Ambassador Joseph S.
Farland* 75

THE UNITED NATIONS, FIRST STEP TOWARD A
WORLD UNDER LAW • *by Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson* . 68

THE
OFFICIAL
WEEKLY RECORD
OF
UNITED STATES
FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XLV, No. 1150 • PUBLICATION 7220

July 10, 1961

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:

53 issues, domestic \$8.50, foreign \$12.25
Single copy, 25 cents

Use of funds for printing of this publication approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1961).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Secretary Rusk's News Conference of June 22

Press release 428 dated June 22

Secretary Rusk: These days the ticker seems to be bringing in news from many quarters. In view of the current interest in the subject, I should like to begin with a comment on Germany and Berlin.

Due to the *de facto* division of Germany, the entire situation in that country is abnormal. The Soviet position in regard to this matter is predicated on the belief that the division of Germany is normal, that the division of Berlin is normal, and that the sole abnormality that persists is West Berlin. This is not a formulation of the problem which is acceptable to the United States.

The militant tone of the speeches made yesterday in Moscow by Chairman Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders must be a source of keen disappointment to those who seek to advance the cause of peace. The effect of these speeches, as the Soviet leaders must have known, can only be to heighten world tensions. The Soviet leaders are aware that they cannot, by any action on their part, extinguish the rights of the Western Powers in Berlin. Although cloaked in the propaganda line that all that they propose to do is to sign a peace treaty with a portion of Germany which they control, their intention is to renounce unilaterally obligations assumed in solemn international agreements. In this connection I might recall that the State Department on March 24, 1960, released the text of the basic agreement¹ concerning the areas which the respective forces of the four occupying powers would occupy in Germany and Greater Berlin.

The United States and its allies have assumed certain basic obligations to protect the freedom of the people of West Berlin. Western forces are in the city by right and remain there to protect those freedoms. The people of West Berlin wel-

come and support those forces, whose presence gives tangible expression to our obligation. It is obvious that the United States could not accept the validity of any claim to extinguish its position in Berlin by unilateral action.

Since the Soviets precipitated the present Berlin crisis in November 1958, the United States and its allies have repeatedly confirmed their position both on the substance of the problem and on their willingness to seek peaceful solutions. I need not review here the history of the long and frequent exchanges of diplomatic notes, of the Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers of 1959, and of discussions which have taken place at the level of heads of government. In all of these the United States and its allies have been sincerely motivated by a desire to end the tensions over Germany and Berlin which the Soviet threats have created. But such solutions cannot be at the expense of our obligations and of the basic principles of freedom and self-determination.

There are many contradictions and historical fallacies in the present position of the Soviet leaders. Chairman Khrushchev's description, in his speech of yesterday, of the alleged origins of World War II will scarcely impress any serious historian.

The Soviets talk constantly of peace but threaten the obvious peace which exists in West Berlin. Having purported to turn over East Berlin to the so-called German Democratic Republic, in violation of existing agreements, they now propose to move in upon the position of West Berlin. If the world is full of anxiety and uneasiness over Berlin, this arises directly from the threat of the Soviets to the rights of others and to the liberty of the West Berliners rather than to anything in the present situation in Berlin.

Demands and threats which create a crisis over a subject which involves the vital interests of other

¹ BULLETIN of Apr. 11, 1960, p. 554.

people do not promote that real peace which the world desires.

The United States and those associated with us are clear and firm about our obligations to ourselves and to the people of West Berlin.

I might just add an informal comment that the Allied Governments are consulting among themselves and with others about a reply to the recent Soviet aide memoire on the subject of Berlin.² These consultations will take a little more time, but when that reply is given it will undoubtedly be made public.

Foreign Aid Proposals

I should also like to comment on the President's foreign aid proposals now being considered by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee.³

These proposals reflect a searching review of our 15 years' experience with foreign aid. It is right and natural that Congress will wish to subject our recommendations to critical examination. What comes out of the deliberations between the Executive and the Congress must be a program adequate to the urgent needs of the world situation.

Foreign aid is much more than a reaction to Communist pressure, but such pressure underscores the seriousness of the struggle in which we and other free peoples are engaged. No one who has studied Mr. Khrushchev's January 6 speech or his speech of yesterday can have any doubts about it. No one who heard him in Vienna talk about the world he hopes to achieve doubted it. The President's report to the Nation after Vienna⁴ left no doubt about the nature of the contest.

The great task of economically advanced nations is to build and strengthen freedom throughout the world. The foreign aid bill, as the President has said, is the single most important program available for building the frontiers of freedom. This is not a time to draw back from or to weaken that program. Foreign aid in the full amounts and with the flexibility requested by the President is vitally—and I mean vitally—necessary to the continued life of our country and the free world of which we are a part.

² An aide memoire on the subject of Berlin was handed to President Kennedy by Premier Khrushchev during their meeting at Vienna June 2-4.

³ For background, see BULLETIN of June 12, 1961, p. 903; June 19, 1961, pp. 947 and 977; and June 28, 1961, p. 1000.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 901.

This is true for two principal reasons. There is a revolution in progress going on in the world today. The greatest question of our day is whether those peoples can carry out that revolution as free men. It is our task and our opportunity to help lead that revolution to a successful conclusion. The goal of the Communist nations is to capture and subvert that revolution. They are working tirelessly toward that end. If we shrink or falter, if our efforts are too little, we can expect to see one free nation after another go under.

This is undoubtedly the most complex and difficult task our Government and our people have ever undertaken, to help nations at various stages of development to make firm economic and social progress.

To succeed in this task we must have the most capable administrators and the most skilled technicians. We must have funds adequate to the needs, and we must have the flexibility to work with nations willing to plan for their own progress and to help them make their plans succeed.

This is a serious work, and we must undertake it with a seriousness needed to accomplish it. The authority and the funds for which the President has asked the Congress are needed in full if our response is to match the requirements of the situation.

I think you have had this afternoon from the White House a communique in connection with the visit of Prime Minister Ikeda [of Japan] and his party.⁵ I think I will not repeat that here but simply call to your attention that this has been a most productive visit, one which we not only greatly enjoyed but from which we have drawn a great benefit.

I think I might take some questions now.

Western Powers' Position in Berlin

Q. Mr. Secretary, during the Berlin blockade we did not forcibly resist the cutoff of our ground access to the city, and then during the Geneva negotiations we made some rather significant concessions in order to bring about some change in the status of Berlin, and then most recently we have not intervened in Laos as some people thought we would and some thought we should. In the light of this history, how can we now convince the Russians, and indeed some of our allies, that we

⁵ See p. 57.

will actually be firm as we say we will be in Berlin?

A. I think the principal point on that is that the position of the Western Powers in Berlin is a powerful one, that the NATO alliance is a strong alliance, that the obligations of the Western Powers are clear, and that Mr. Khrushchev must be given every opportunity, as he will be, to avoid a miscalculation on a matter of that sort.

Q. Mr. Secretary, this is a related question. Many people feel Senator [Mike] Mansfield was flying a kite for the administration when he made his proposal last week on the Berlin question. Would you comment on that?

A. I think Senator Mansfield answered that in pointing out that he was speaking as an individual Senator. He was not speaking for the administration.

Q. What is your feeling about the Mansfield proposal?

A. Well, there will be undoubtedly some public discussion and debate of an issue as important as Berlin, but the attitude of the President and of the occupying powers and the NATO countries has been expressed on many occasions. That attitude stands. I think that's all I would say on that at the present time.

Current Crisis on Berlin

Q. Mr. Secretary, Premier Khrushchev in his speech said he intends to sign a peace treaty with the East Germans at the end of the year. Now this is being viewed in some quarters as an ultimatum. Do you look on it as an ultimatum?

A. I wouldn't use a rather simple and easy word to cover a very complex and difficult situation. Obviously the statements made by Mr. Khrushchev before, during, and after Vienna are serious statements and ought to be taken seriously. The substance of what he said is very similar to the positions taken some 2 years ago about Berlin, but I think it would be wrong for us to try to cover a situation of this sort with too simple a characterization, such as this word "ultimatum."

Q. Could I pose the same question this way: Do you consider that the current crisis on Berlin as it now appears to be developing for the rest of

this year represents in fact the most serious Soviet or Communist threat to the West since the end of World War II or the beginning of the cold-war period?

A. Well, again I should like to avoid a superlative. This I think is a serious situation, serious enough to engage a lot of our attention—the attention of the Western World—and indeed the attention of all those in other parts of the world who are concerned with building a peace.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you have said in your earlier remarks that the United States had shown its willingness in the past to seek peaceful solutions. Is it our current belief that a peaceful solution to the Berlin crisis is possible, and, if so, can you tell us on what basis we would seek a peaceful solution?

A. I wouldn't wish to speculate about the future on a question of that sort. If you go back to 1946 and follow the record from there, the West has made many attempts to find a settlement for these problems involving the windup of World War II and has had little or no cooperation from the Soviet Union. This takes us back to the first Berlin blockade; it can take us back to Korea; it can take us back to the earlier negotiations about the reunification of Germany; it can take us back to the settlements in Central Europe and Eastern Europe. There has been a continuous effort on the part of the West to wind up peacefully and honorably and effectively the results of World War II. Had we had anything like a comparable point of view from the Soviet Union on these questions, they would have long since been resolved.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you have said that our position stands, and I believe that Mr. Kennedy said there was no intention to depart from our position of defending our rights in Berlin. The question that I have concerns the necessity for some kind of consultation with our allies before answering this aide memoire. The position has been answered so many times that it leads me to ask whether there are new elements to be considered or whether there are new approaches being considered to the problems which have not been undertaken before or considered before.

A. I think it would be natural and normal when we receive an aide memoire from the Soviet Union

on Berlin and on Germany to talk that question over with other governments who have a direct interest and stake in the question, as well as a number of other governments. We are in West Berlin with the United Kingdom and France. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is obviously involved. NATO has expressed itself on Berlin and of course the NATO governments have an interest in that problem, as do other governments in other places. The fact that we are consulting other governments with respect to the reply does not mean that we don't know what to say. We want to be sure that we are in touch with them. We think they have a right to be consulted. From our point of view it is very important they be consulted before we publish a reply to an important communication such as the one Mr. Khrushchev recently made about Berlin.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you said the situation was abnormal, and then you said Mr. Khrushchev would be given every opportunity not to make a miscalculation. By that are you implying the possibility if the situation gets serious enough for another summit conference, and if freedom is not negotiable in Berlin, what is?

A. I did not suggest any particular mode or method of communication. We will undoubtedly be having further exchanges among governments on Berlin, including exchanges with the Soviet Union, but questions of any special form of discussion are wholly for the future. But you can be sure that there will be representations back and forth from governments on this question for some time to come.

Visits of Indian and Pakistan Leaders

Q. Mr. Secretary, in another area, there have been reports that Prime Minister Nehru of India might come here in the near future, and there was also the White House announcement that President Ayub Khan of Pakistan will advance his visit from November to July. Could you tell us what the significance of these moves is and how desirable the visits are?

A. Well, let me say right away the two are not related. It would be, of course, extremely helpful if Mr. Nehru and the President could have a chance to talk over a great many matters, but there are no definite plans or dates or arrange-

ments for that at the present time. President Ayub's visit was expedited as a result of the Vice President's visit out there,⁶ and we are looking forward to seeing him in mid-July with great anticipation. There are a great many things we would like to talk about, of course, with both these great leaders, but these arrangements are not linked or interrelated.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there has been a report that there was an assassination plot against Ambassador Stevenson in Argentina. Can you tell us what you know about that?

A. I gather that that report started because one of our Marine guards was wounded by a civilian in the Argentine, but that occurred after Ambassador Stevenson had left. There was no indication whatever that there was any connection between that incident and any visit made by Mr. Stevenson. I am glad to say that the Marine guard seems to be in no danger and seems to be recovering nicely.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in any permanent peace settlement, is it being contemplated that the present border of Central and Eastern Europe might be changed?

A. Well, these are questions which undoubtedly will be considered in the future as they have been in the past. I think it would be quite wrong for me to speculate about or comment specifically on questions of that sort at this point.

Q. Mr. Secretary, following the assassination of General Trujillo, there was some hope expressed that the Dominican Republic with the aid of the Organization of American States would go through a peaceful transition to democracy, and the OAS committee went down there for 7 days with the express statement of the State Department that they should remain there a little longer. Does the United States have any plan now to ask the Organization of American States to take a new look at conditions there?

A. Well, such plans as there might be are not in that specific form at this point. We do think that the visit of the OAS committee was a very helpful episode, and we think that the OAS must continue to be interested in the events of the Dominican Republic and keep in touch with them.

⁶For text of a communique between Vice President Johnson and President Ayub, see BULLETIN of June 19, 1961, p. 960.

We ourselves are following the situation in the Dominican Republic very closely, and I hope very much that matters there can move toward normal and constitutional government as rapidly as possible.

Q. Mr. Secretary, the three Laotian princes have issued a communique in Zurich which pledges to form a government of national union. The communique says that this government would not seek the protection of any foreign alliance or any external guarantee. Do we consider that this automatically ends the protective umbrella that the SEATO [Southeast Asia Treaty Organization] alliance has given to Laos?

A. Well, the communique of the three princes, which I have just in the last few minutes seen from the tickers, is a statement which came out of their own consultations. It was not put forward as a governmental statement. But a declaration of that sort could not affect the intergovernmental arrangements as far as SEATO is concerned. The SEATO governments have made these security arrangements and have made certain applications of them in their own interest in the security of the region of southeast Asia. It will be for those who make up SEATO to make any determination on a question of that sort, and that has not come before SEATO.

Q. Mr. Secretary, is it true that discussions with the Japanese on the export quota on textiles have reached an impasse and that there is a likelihood that no agreement will be reached for this year?

A. The question of textile trade with Japan is, of course, one of the very important questions between our two countries. We can expect at any one time some fairly complicated issues between two great trading nations such as Japan and the United States, where we are moving about \$1 billion worth of products in each direction each year at the present time. The textile problem needs to be taken up on a multilateral basis; the principal consumers of textile imports and the principal producers of textile exports need to think about the stabilization of an orderly world market which affords opportunity for reasonable growth.⁷ And so we will be in a considerable period of discussion among governments on this very complicated and difficult problem of textiles. I would not say that we and the Japanese have reached an impasse

on the matter. I think we have made some real progress.

Q. Mr. Secretary, to go back to Berlin again, the impression which I think you have left—and I wonder if it is the correct one—is that despite the fact that this Government here feels that the crisis has been entirely of Soviet origin, nevertheless the United States and its allies are willing to sit down and try to negotiate once again with the Soviet Union over the whole question of Germany and Berlin. Is that a correct inference?

A. A question of that sort tends to put any official in somewhat of a box. On the one side you are never in a position to say—or would want to say—that you are going to quit communicating among governments about any important question. On the other side, the implication that you are going to communicate among governments, and are willing to communicate among governments, is easily interpreted as meaning a radical revision of position. This is not the case. The essential thing is that the three Western Powers, as the President put it, are in Berlin not by sufferance but by right, and those rights can't be terminated by unilateral action taken by the Soviet Union. You start from there. And our commitments to the people of West Berlin are very strong and very far-reaching.

Geneva Test Ban Talks

Q. Mr. Secretary, in view of the deadlock in the Geneva test ban talks, what are the intentions of the administration (1) for continuing those talks and (2) for resumption of atomic tests?

A. Well, first, we do expect to continue those talks and take advantage of any opportunity that might come for moving toward a treaty. What we really want in the nuclear test field is an international treaty which provides cessation of such tests with adequate inspection and control. We have had a serious setback in the uncooperative attitude of the Soviet Union in the Geneva discussions. We do not intend to merge these talks with general disarmament discussions.

Of course, in the absence of an effective treaty the question of a moratorium inevitably arises, and the question of the national security interests of the United States is one which has to be clearly, thoroughly canvassed. Those are matters that are being looked into very carefully at the present

⁷ See p. 90.

time, of course. But I would not wish to speculate today about what the decisions would have to be or might be on that question.

Q. Mr. Secretary, some days ago—to come back to the other question—some days ago the State Department very clearly expressed its disappointment in the fact that the committee stayed—that the OAS committee had stayed such a short time in the Dominican Republic. You, however, have called this visit of this committee a very helpful episode. I wonder if anything has happened in the intervening period to change the Department's view of it?

A. Perhaps I just don't use as many adjectives as my colleagues. We think that the OAS must continue to follow the situation in the Dominican Republic. How and in what way, how best to do it, is something that has to be worked on. But I personally believe the OAS committee left the Dominican Republic somewhat too soon. But that at the moment is behind us. We start from where we are and go on from here.

Question of East German Peace Treaty

Q. On the question of Berlin again, is our concern directed toward the signing of an East German peace treaty or toward a possible effort to oust the West from West Berlin? Suppose they sign such a treaty and make no effort to cut off the access routes?

A. Well, again, we don't want to speculate too much about future contingencies here in the situation. But any attempt to freeze the position in Germany without due regard to the wishes of the German people would be, in our judgment, a very unfortunate step to take. The Soviet Union and its representatives have stood up in the United Nations from time to time and made a great play over their commitment to the notion of self-determination in various parts of the world. They have been unwilling to apply that same principle to Central Europe.

If you want to start at the heart of the matter, our own national interest starts with our position in West Berlin and our commitment to the people of that city. This doesn't mean that this exhausts our interest in it. We also have, stemming out of wartime agreements, an interest in East Berlin. As a nation that was at war with Germany and one of the United Nations, we have

an interest in a peace settlement for Germany. But I wouldn't want to water down in any way the heart of our interest, which is our position in West Berlin and our commitments to the people of that city.

Q. In that connection, sir, the question has arisen as to whether we would object to having the East Germans sign papers on the access routes.

A. Well, that is a question I'd prefer to leave for the future. Because obviously, as a policy matter, this is not something that we like at all, and it's something about which we will be very much concerned, and this would be a matter of discussion among governments. But this is all for the future.

Talks on Resuming Disarmament Negotiations

Q. Mr. Secretary, could you tell us how the McCloy-Zorin^{} talks are going, whether they are making any progress, whether you think the disarmament talks will get started by July 31?*

A. These talks, I think, are now in about their third day. They are a continuation of talks that began at the United Nations' resumed session of the General Assembly. By agreement between the Governments, these talks are still in their private stage. We do not expect to be making public statements immediately upon the nature of the talks or the progress of the talks. Other governments are being kept informed. It would be, I think, much too early to say whether we are hopeful that anything might come out of them. They are continuing, however. We meet again tomorrow.

Q. Mr. Secretary, Premier Khrushchev, in justifying his proposal to go ahead with a separate peace treaty with East Germany, drew an analogy with the Western treaty without the Russians with Japan. Do you accept that analogy?

A. We do not. There are several important differences between the Japanese Peace Treaty and this proposal to sign a treaty with the so-called East German Republic. In the case of Japan, there was a representative, elected govern-

^{*} John J. McCloy, Adviser to the President, and Valerian A. Zorin, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister; for text of a joint communique, see p. 57.

ment representing a unified nation with which to sign a peace treaty. There were 49 nations, I believe, which did in fact sign that peace treaty. The Soviet Union was consulted by the then Ambassador, John Foster Dulles, in the early stages and had an opportunity to consult freely prior to the meeting of the Japanese Peace Conference in San Francisco. They did not avail themselves of the full opportunity that was there for them for consultation.

At the conference itself the Russians attended, and the conference agreed to proceed to sign a treaty. That treaty did not purport to, nor did it, affect any tangible rights of the Soviet Union in Japan. The situation in Berlin involves quite a different situation, with the United States and France and the United Kingdom exercising very specific rights and obligations in West Berlin. There was nothing like that in the Japanese situation at all. Nor did we have a representative government in Germany to decide for all of Germany and certainly not a representative government in the so-called East German Republic. I think the situations are quite different.

Q. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

U.S., U.S.S.R. Discuss Framework and Forum for Disarmament Talks

Joint Communiqué

Today, June 19, in Washington, in accordance with the agreement previously reached between the Government of the U.S.S.R. and the Government of the U.S.A., an exchange of views was opened on questions relating to disarmament and to the resumption of negotiations in an appropriate body, whose composition is to be agreed upon.

The Delegation of the U.S.S.R. includes: V. A. Zorin, Deputy Foreign Minister of the U.S.S.R., Permanent Representative of the U.S.S.R. to the United Nations (Head of the Delegation); M. A. Menshikov, Ambassador of the U.S.S.R. to the United States; A. A. Gryzlov, Col. Gen.; I. G. Usachev, Deputy Director of the Department of International Organizations of the U.S.S.R. Foreign Ministry; as well as advisers and experts.

Participants from the United States include: John J. McCloy, Adviser to the President; Edmund A. Gullion, Deputy Director, U.S. Disarma-

ment Administration; Adrian Fisher, Deputy to the Adviser to the President; Ronald I. Spiers, Director, Political Staff, U.S. Disarmament Administration; Robert E. Matteson, Director, Policy Staff, U.S. Disarmament Administration; as well as advisers and experts.

The American and Soviet sides have exchanged views upon the procedure of the work and on the ways of solving the problems before them.

Prime Minister of Japan Concludes Official Visit to Washington

Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda of Japan made an official visit to Washington June 20-23. Following are texts of a joint communiqué issued by President Kennedy and Prime Minister Ikeda on June 22 and an exchange of notes between Secretary Rusk and Japanese Foreign Minister Zentaro Kosaka, together with a list of the members of the Prime Minister's official party.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE

White House press release dated June 22

President Kennedy and Prime Minister Ikeda concluded today a constructive and friendly exchange of views on the present international situation and on relations between the United States and Japan. Secretary Rusk, Foreign Minister Kosaka, and other U.S. and Japanese officials participated in the conversations.

The President and the Prime Minister discussed various problems confronting the peoples of the world who are resolved to defend their freedom, and they reaffirmed the determination of the two countries to intensify their efforts toward the establishment of world peace based on freedom and justice. The President and the Prime Minister stressed that the common policy of the two countries is to strengthen the authority of the United Nations as an organ for the maintenance of world peace.

The President and the Prime Minister expressed their concern over the unstable aspects of the situation in Asia and agreed to hold close consultations in the future with a view to discovering the ways and means by which stability and well-being might be achieved in that area. Their discussion of the Asian situation included an examination

of various problems relating to Communist China. They also exchanged views concerning the relations of their respective countries with Korea.

The President and the Prime Minister recognized the urgent need for an agreement on a nuclear test ban accompanied by effective inspection and control measures, agreeing that it is of crucial importance for world peace. They also expressed their conviction that renewed efforts should be made in the direction of general disarmament.

The President and the Prime Minister reviewed the world economic situation. They agreed on the need for continued close cooperation among the free countries of the world, particularly in promoting the growth of international trade and financial stability. They agreed that both countries should pursue liberal trade policies looking to an orderly expansion of trade between the two countries.

The President and the Prime Minister stressed the importance of development assistance to less developed countries. The Prime Minister expressed a particular interest in this connection in development assistance for East Asia. They agreed to exchange views on such assistance and agreed that both countries would make positive efforts to the extent of their respective capacities.

The President and the Prime Minister expressed satisfaction with the firm foundation on which the United States-Japanese partnership is established. To strengthen the partnership between the two countries, they agreed to establish a Joint United States-Japan Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs at the cabinet level, noting that this would assist in achieving the objectives of Article II of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security.¹ The President and the Prime Minister also recognized the importance of broadening educational, cultural and scientific cooperation between the two countries. They therefore agreed to form two United States-Japan committees, one to study expanded cultural and educational cooperation between the two countries, and the other to seek ways to strengthen scientific cooperation.

The President and the Prime Minister exchanged views on matters relating to the Ryukyu and Bonin Islands, which are under United States administration but in which Japan retains resid-

ual sovereignty. The President affirmed that the United States would make further efforts to enhance the welfare and well-being of the inhabitants of the Ryukyus and welcomed Japanese cooperation in these efforts; the Prime Minister affirmed that Japan would continue to cooperate with the United States to this end.

EXCHANGE OF NOTES

Press release 429 dated June 22

U.S. Note

JUNE 22, 1961

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to recent discussions between the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of Japan concerning the desirability of developing arrangements for consultations between our two Governments on economic matters of mutual concern. In this connection, it was noted that in Article II of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States of America and Japan, signed at Washington, January 19, 1960, both Parties agreed that "They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between them." These discussions revealed a desire on the part of both Governments to establish a committee for periodic consultation between their respective Cabinet members having major responsibility for economic policy.

I have the honor to propose, therefore, that our two Governments agree:

(a) That there shall be established a Joint United States-Japan Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs;

(b) That the Committee shall consist:

for the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, of the Secretaries of State, the Treasury, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and,

for JAPAN, of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs, Finance, Agriculture and Forestry, International Trade and Industry, and Labor, and the Director General of the Economic Planning Agency,

together with such other officials of Cabinet rank as either Government may designate from time to time, as the need arises;

¹ For text, see BULLETIN of Feb. 8, 1960, p. 184.

(c) That the Committee's functions shall be:

- (1) To consider means of promoting economic collaboration between the two countries;
- (2) In particular, to exchange information and views on matters which might adversely affect the continued expansion of mutually profitable trade and on questions relating to the economic assistance programs of the two countries which require joint consideration;
- (3) To report to the respective Governments on such discussions in order that consideration may be given to measures deemed appropriate and necessary to eliminate conflict in the international economic policies of the two countries, to provide for a fuller measure of economic collaboration, and to encourage the flow of trade;

(d) That the Committee shall meet once a year or more often, as may be considered necessary by the two Governments;

(e) That the Committee shall meet alternately in the United States and Japan, the Chairman to be the United States Secretary of State or another member designated by the United States Government when meetings are held in the United States and the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs or another member designated by the Japanese Government when meetings are held in Japan.

If the Government of Japan is agreeable to the foregoing proposals, I suggest that the present note and Your Excellency's reply to that effect should constitute an agreement between our two Governments which shall take effect this day and shall remain in force until such time as either Government shall have given notice in writing of its desire to terminate the agreement.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

DEAN RUSK
*Secretary of State of the
United States of America*

His Excellency
ZENTARO KOSAKA,
Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan.

Japanese Note

JUNE 22, 1961

EXCELLENCY: I have the honour to refer to Your Excellency's note of today's date in which you propose the establishment of a Joint United States-Japan Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs.

I have the honour to inform Your Excellency that the Government of Japan concurs in these proposals and agrees that your note and the present reply shall constitute an agreement between our two Governments which shall take effect this day and shall remain in force until such time as either Government shall have given notice in writing of its desire to terminate the agreement.

I avail myself of this opportunity to extend to Your Excellency the assurance of my highest consideration.

ZENTARO KOSAKA

The Honorable
DEAN RUSK
*Secretary of State
of the United States of America*

MEMBERS OF PRIME MINISTER'S PARTY

The Department of State announced on June 14 (press release 396) that the following would make up the official members of Prime Minister Ikeda's party:

Hayato Ikeda, Prime Minister of Japan
Mrs. Hayato Ikeda
Zentaro Kosaka, Minister of Foreign Affairs
Koichiro Asakai, Ambassador of Japan
Kiichi Miyazawa, Member of the House of Councilors
Shigenobu Shima, Deputy Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs
Nobuhiko Ushiba, Director of the Economic Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Toshiro Shimanouchi, Counselor of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Hiroshi Hitomi, private secretary to the Prime Minister
Yoshiro Okawara, private secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs

Two New Members of Commission on Educational Exchange Confirmed

The Senate on June 12 confirmed the appointment of Walter Adams and Mabel M. Smyth to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 412 dated June 19.)

U.S. and Italy Reaffirm Common Aim of Promoting Peace and Progress

Aminore Fanfani, President of the Council of Ministers of the Italian Republic, made an informal visit to the United States June 11-16. Following is the text of a joint communique issued by President Kennedy and Prime Minister Fanfani at the conclusion of their discussions, held June 12 and 13, and a list of the members of the Prime Minister's party.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE

White House press release dated June 13

President Kennedy and Prime Minister Aminore Fanfani today concluded a cordial and constructive two day series of consultations on a broad range of international problems and matters of interest to the governments and peoples of the United States and Italy who are engaged in the work of defending freedom and strengthening peace. The two reviewed the important role which Italy has played in the rebuilding of post-war Europe and the extraordinary rise of Italian strength and vigor in this era.

They reaffirmed the strong ties of friendship and heritage which bind the two countries.

The President and the Prime Minister met alone for a period of time and were later joined in discussions by Foreign Minister Antonio Segni, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Ambassador Sergio Fenoaltea, Ambassador G. Frederick Reinhardt and other high officers of the foreign ministries of both countries. President Kennedy informed the Prime Minister in detail concerning his recent conversations with Premier Khrushchev in Vienna¹ and views were exchanged on the principal issues involved, including Berlin and disarmament. The President and the Prime Minister found themselves in complete agreement on the need for strengthening the Atlantic community both as an instrument of defense and in its political and economic aspects and for maintaining and developing the closest Western consultations on all major international questions.

¹ BULLETIN of June 26, 1961, p. 991.

There was concurrence on the need for continuing international efforts to reach a workable agreement on disarmament with adequate safeguards. They also agreed on the importance and utility of further progress towards European integration and on the need for continuing Western solidarity in the face of the unrelenting Communist challenge to the cause of freedom.

The two leaders also discussed in detail the problems related to economic and technical assistance to the newly-emerging and developing countries of the world with particular reference to the countries of the Mediterranean area, Latin America and Africa—areas where Italy has especially close ties based on history, culture and economic association.

Prime Minister Fanfani stated in this regard that the Italian Government—within the limits of Italy's capabilities and of the engagements already undertaken for the development of Italy's southern regions—is ready to participate with its contribution to the implementation of these programs which will be agreed upon. It was agreed that in making plans for the further elaboration of the program for assisting emerging and developing nations the two governments should maintain contact between themselves and with the many other friendly governments as well as the governments concerned whose support and participation are essential to the success of the program.

Prime Minister Fanfani also had meetings during his visit with the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Douglas Dillon. Foreign Minister Segni also met with Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. The Italian leaders also met with leaders of both Houses of Congress.

This meeting again confirmed the profound and intimate relations between the two countries and the common aspirations of these governments to maintain peace and security and freedom in the promotion of the welfare of the peoples of the world.

Prime Minister Fanfani is expected to leave Washington by car tomorrow morning, June 14, for further visits in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York before his return to Italy on June 16. Foreign Minister Segni will return to Italy on June 14.

MEMBERS OF PARTY

The Department of State announced on June 9 (press release 380) that the following would accompany Prime Minister Fanfani during his visit to the United States:

Antonio Segni, Minister of Foreign Affairs
Sergio Fenoaltea, Ambassador of Italy
Giovanni Fornari, Director General of Political Affairs
Francesco Paolo Vanni D'Archirafi, Diplomatic Adviser to Prime Minister Fanfani
Federico Sensi, Chief of Cabinet to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Vittoriano Manfredi, Counselor of Embassy
Hombert Bianchi, Chief of the Press Office of the Presidency of the Council
Felice Marchioni, Chief of Protocol of the Presidency of the Council

Ambassador Stevenson Returns From Visit to South America

Statement by Ambassador Stevenson¹

I am mighty glad to be home again after this fast and tiring journey. But it was successful in all respects. We have enjoyed an extraordinary welcome and hospitality everywhere and exchanged views, in the frankness permitted by true friendship, about common problems and aspirations.

Since our departure on June 4th, my colleagues and I have visited all 10 countries of South America.² I have talked in each capital with the chief of state and his ministers. So far as time permitted, we have also talked with other persons representing different sections of public opinion—leaders of political parties, labor and business leaders—and students. And of course we have talked with representatives of the press.

My heart was warmed by the very cordial reception we have received everywhere. This has been gratifying to me personally. It has also been a demonstration of the confidence of our Latin American neighbors in President Kennedy and his policies and of their good will toward the

people of the United States. The hostile manifestations were few and inconsequential.

We found a tremendous interest and hope in the Alliance for Progress.³ The conviction is universal that more rapid social and economic development is imperative. While this is a long-range undertaking, it is important to demonstrate promptly that we are making progress on this front. We were gratified by the awareness of South American leaders that old molds have to be broken and that society which does not translate economic progress into social progress is doomed.

For our part, we have assured our South American friends that we are sincerely interested in helping them to help themselves. Though there are common problems of poverty, disease, illiteracy, housing, high birth rates, education, land and tax reform, each country in America is different and resolutely asserts that fact. We think we have made our view clear to all that it is up to each country to do what is required to put its house in order and then to mobilize and use its resources, together with external assistance, efficiently and for the benefit of all its people.

In each country there have been discussions of the preparations for the forthcoming ministerial meeting in Uruguay of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council. We found that much planning has already been done for this meeting. The planning was at a stage where an exchange of views on the agenda was mutually helpful in each country. And I have to add that there is widespread concern about whether Congress will support the Alliance for Progress program so as to make it truly effective.

These consultations have served to reaffirm the close relationship between social and economic progress and the preservation and strengthening of democratic institutions.

Each country has its own political problems, and if I have any reservations it is the preoccupation in most countries with domestic in contrast to international problems. Political liberty cannot long subsist without economic progress and social justice. Yet to barter liberty for social gains is too high a price. And if there was any idea that

¹ Made at Washington National Airport on June 22 (press release 433 dated June 23). Mr. Stevenson is U.S. Representative to the United Nations.

² For a statement by President Kennedy and a Department announcement, see BULLETIN of June 19, 1961, p. 970.

³ *Ibid.*, Apr. 3, 1961, p. 471, and June 19, 1961, p. 971.

communism in Cuba is only a problem for the United States, I believe we dispelled this illusion.

I wish again to say how much I regret not having been able to consult with all the American governments who joined with us in adopting the Act of Bogotá.⁴ I want to assure them that their problems and views are of no less interest and con-

cern to us, because within the time available it was impossible for me to visit them also. And I hope that omission can be quickly rectified by another representative of the President.

I am looking forward now to reporting to the President and to the Secretary of State on the details of our consultations during the past 18 days.

Our Changing World

by Charles E. Bohlen

Special Assistant to the Secretary of State¹

So swift are the events in the world which press in on us from the outside, so deep the changes within our own country, that it is extremely difficult to take one central factor on an occasion such as this. I have, however, selected the word "change" for this address.

This word assumed special significance in the last 30 years—the period of one generation. From the point of view of history it has been particularly acute and striking during this period. For many hundreds of years prior to that period, change was slow. Through generations the elements of change proceeded in easy fashion, occasionally marked by violent outbreaks, and the fundamental basis on which the world was organized appeared to any person at any given time as an orderly and leisurely process. The evolution of the human race was a subject primarily for historians, to be studied at leisure, analyzed carefully, and pondered upon.

Nostalgia for the good old days is essentially a privilege of age. It is not a function or a necessity of youth. But let us then look at the changes which have occurred in the world in the space of one generation, customarily accepted as 30 years. Much of the times, which I will briefly discuss, will have no more relevance to your con-

sciousness or your activities than those relating to the times of ancient Greece or Rome. They will be studied with interest, I trust, and understanding, I hope, since that which has preceded us contains the elements of change we have to deal with today.

The changes I am about to describe have occurred with such bewildering speed that it is extremely difficult for any individual, no matter how closely associated with the affairs of this world, to keep pace with them. Many of these changes are obvious and can be readily recognized. Emergence into full nationhood of some 41 countries, out of 111 generally recognized nations of the world today, is readily understood and accepted as such by those in whose lifetime it has occurred. But the subtleties, the concealed nature of change, are difficult to ascertain and almost impossible to comprehend. They involve the psychological adjustment of human beings to different and altered objective circumstances. They involve, on our part, an absorption and an adjustment which severely taxes the capacity of the human being, especially if he is dealing with events which include in themselves some of these changes.

Change, by its very nature, is an infectious thing, and there is always the tendency in every human being to consider that what he learns in youth is the absolute and that change should be regarded as due to malevolence or "crackpotism"

⁴ For text, see *ibid.*, Oct. 3, 1960, p. 537.

¹ Address made at commencement exercises at Radcliffe College, Cambridge, Mass., on June 14 (press release 390).

or some other quality which by popular expression we have come to regard as a temporary aberration, with little or no relevance to the main tides of this life.

It is one of the characteristics of the human being to resist realities of change as a temporary, immaterial matter which does not require much adjustment on his part. In fact I would say in a larger sense that one characteristic of any given human society is to have an image of itself which is at least 30 to 40 years out of date.

The World of 1931

Thirty years ago we in the United States were confronted with a world that seemed stable in its institutions, fixed in its prospects, and dedicated in its reasoning to the precepts of Western Christian civilization. There were then, however, visible in the existing world, signs of the changes which were to burst upon it and to uproot many of its most cherished beliefs. These changes were at work in one of the potentially great powers of the world—Russia. They were at work in Germany while the seeds of disruption were in progress in the Republic of Weimar that culminated in the rise to power of Adolph Hitler. They were at work, although far beneath the surface, in the entire colonial areas of the world.

These signs were foreseen by a few, but by very few. Even in the ability to foresee the course of human events the full dimensions of the incipient changes were perhaps mercifully hidden. The growth of technology was apparent, but little understood. The growth of the media of communication—the radio and, more recently, television—was clearly on the march ahead, but not fully comprehended. In an orderly but troubled world the signs of change were slowly growing without too much impact upon those who were directing events.

The vast areas of the world which occupy so much of our attention seemed to be securely within the hands of the Western democracies. Africa—with the exception of Liberia and the Union of South Africa—was entirely under colonial rule. Some were under the League of Nations mandate, with its implicit promise of eventual independence; others were under the direct rule of France and England, which emerged from World War I, on paper at least, as the dominant nations of the world.

In Asia the situation was somewhat more spotty. The Philippines, an American colonial possession at that time, were about to receive—in 1935—the promise of eventual independence, which played so great a part in the attitude of the Philippine people toward the United States. Japan was independent. China too was independent but with a series of interlaced accommodations which the Western Powers had enforced upon it. China was torn by civil war and hardly capable of being accepted as an independent power. Thailand was the only independent country in southeast Asia. Indonesia was Dutch; Indochina, French.

Moving westward, we found the English in control over the vast human and material resources of India. The Middle East, with so-called independent governments, was nonetheless firmly under the influence of the two Western democracies, France and England.

Indeed, an examination of the world in 1931 revealed that, apart from Europe, only South America, the United States, the British Commonwealth, Japan, and possibly China, and the exceptions noted in Asia were independent in any true sense of the word. The British Fleet stood guard throughout the entire world. The United States at this period of its development was protected by these two great democracies of Western Europe. We had little to worry about except the development of our own continent.

The World as It Looks Today

Now let us look at the world as it looks today. World War II smashed the two great power centers, Germany and Japan, which had sought to impose their will upon the civilized world. But we have been engaged in restoring what we destroyed. Entirely different landscape came into being as a result of that event.

In Asia the tide of freedom has rolled far and fast and there is not in that area a single colonial possession of any importance held by any Western power. The Philippines, in conformity with the understanding reached with the United States in 1935, became a free and independent country. Indonesia, after a brief but bitter struggle with the Dutch, emerged into nationhood. India, after a period of internecine strife, developed into two countries, India and Pakistan, which have already made their mark on international history. China, beset by internal change, has come to be

the second Communist power in the world. The countries of Eastern Europe display the unmistakable imprint of an alien hand. The countries of the Middle East, without exception, have emerged as a series of independent countries. Africa, that vast Dark Continent, has in the last 10 years given signs of the deep thirst for independence among its varied peoples. There are now from Africa 24 new nations, with all the characteristics of newly won independence, fiercely proud of the new status they have achieved, sensitive to any slights, and impatient of any imagined bonds. In Africa there remain some areas which have not yet achieved their independence, but if we can read the signs of coming events, they most certainly will.

The change that has affected these vast areas of the world has not, of course, been without effect on the former possessing countries. If we examine merely those areas of the former colonial empires of the world and consider what unheard-of changes they have imposed upon our country, this in itself should bring home to us, with the utmost clarity and sharpness, the effect upon our country and its position in the world today.

America's Response to Change

The dimensions of American activities in the foreign field in the last 30 years have moved ahead faster than their results can be absorbed by the popular consciousness. And this simple fact is of immediate importance.

Our civilization is the most successful in material results of any that have existed before in history. We are a people replete with the good things of life, with a greater degree of our citizens enjoying these fruits of our system, with shorter hours of work, with more leisure—a society which by its own spectacular successes has produced a greater state of well-being for the great majority of its citizens, more secure in the enjoyment of the rights of self-government than any recorded society in history, either past or present, can register.

However, there are many aspects of our civilization which, despite these positive achievements, should cause us as citizens of this country to give pause before we assert our supremacy before the world. There is the racial problem, whose main elements are clear enough to you, so that I need not elaborate upon them. There is the problem of education—how to have our children enjoy the

essential requirement of education. There is also the character of our free economy, which seems to require, every so often, a period of recession.

These are domestic problems, and it is not my intention to go into them at any length; but they do have an impact on our foreign policy, and every one of you, no matter what position you occupy in our society, will have a direct part in the resolution of these problems. In this sense you will be an active participant in the formulation of our foreign policy, for every citizen in this country does have such an impact. What he or she does in his daily life will help build up the image—I would prefer another word—of the United States and its efforts throughout the world.

If we neglect those things which should be done at home, we can hardly seek to preach abroad what we would like to see done. The world is in full motion today. New forces—that is, new to us—are at work changing the entire landscape of the world. This process will undoubtedly continue at an accelerated pace during the entire lifetime of everyone present here. Our internal reactions will have to step up to keep pace with those happening in the world. This is not an easy process or one, in general, which our education and training has equipped us to deal with. It is, however, in essence, the difference between revolution and evolution.

Change is inevitable. But the nature of change, the degree of response with which we meet it, is perhaps the most important facet in the entire process. If we accept as a fact that change is inevitable, then our ability to adjust in time—and totally—becomes much easier. The response of the coming generation, the ability to absorb and adjust to the process of change, will be perhaps its most determinant quality.

If our society with its inherent freedom, its flexible method of adjustment, can rise to the measure of this task, there is real hope that we can dominate the tumults of the immediate future.

Erroneous Assumption of Communism

In addition to the factor of change by itself, we are confronted with the presence and involvement of an adversary, alert, vigorous, and ruthless. This adversary is accepted under the frequently but not always misleading term of "communism." Time will not permit me to go into any depth or detail as to the nature of this phenomenon and its

progress to the dimensions that it has acquired today. It is sufficient at this time merely to state that it is based upon a body of thought which recognizes, even more fully than I have today, the question of change in the world and the possibility of exploiting it. It brings 43 years of experience in practice and, despite variations produced by different objective circumstances, holds firmly to the central core of its being—the class struggle. This is that all human affairs are subject to the control of what is termed the class conflict; that class conflict, with the smooth working of an exercise in logic, is presented as universal in its application to this world. It knows no doubts. But it does have fears. It is the great example of an erroneous assumption, translated through the mechanisms of power into a clear and sobering actuality.

From the planting of this seed in Russia in 1917, when there were less than 400,000 members of the Bolshevik Party in that country, it has developed and has spread to encompass almost 1 billion people. Backed by all the panoply of power that modern science can give it, it has tested and perfected its methods of application.

The holders of this creed—and creed it is—have no understanding of the glorious freedom of choice. They see in change a blind process that leads humanity to one, and only one, end. This is clearly intolerable to the human spirit as we see it. The spirit of choice is one of the manifestations of human freedom. There is no other—and this is for what we fight.

It is indeed a formidable adversary, but, with the greatest advances it has made on the face of the globe since 1917, it has still within it the fallacy of erroneous assumption. And despite the glitter of its material consequences, it was launched on error. For truth, in the long run, always prevails, and we have against this doctrine the cause which, by its very nature, is unconquerable—freedom. The deepest aspirations of mankind recorded through the flow of history have always been a society and a condition under which the individual human person will find some expression for himself. We must hold fast to these simple and, as has been truly said, eternal verities. They are infinite in their variety; they affect but are unaffected by the vast challenge of our times. We must beware of accepting as permanent that which is a convenience and which has worked

very well in a given situation. We must learn to segregate out that which is eternal and that which is not.

The Prospects Ahead

There must be to you one central question in contemplating the prospects which lie ahead. That is, what can you do during this period to make your individual contribution to your country's efforts to safeguard the values which you have received and which we are all trying to protect? In his inaugural speech,² President Kennedy said:

... ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

It is difficult for you to find a comforting answer to this question. It is not for us who are in your Government to set forth a pattern and a concrete purpose for your lives. There is no ready answer, I can assure you. You must be aware of the fact that change is the normal and not the unusual—but the central reality of our times. This change, the manner in which this change is dealt with—whether it be within the limited sphere of our own life or in the larger sphere of government activity—this change should be recognized as a natural concomitant of your life. We must draw from within us those things which the study of history has shown to be true and permanent and stick to those with all the consciousness and dedication which we can muster.

What I have described, very briefly, of the fundamental changes that have occurred in the last generation are nothing to what will occur in the next. And it is you and your counterparts who are now stepping out into it who will bear the brunt of the new epoch of the 1960's and 1970's and 1980's. The changes will be more rapid and more profound even than the ones I have depicted to you. The thresholds of sciences have been attacked on all sectors. The cumulative effects of these efforts will be known in the coming years. But the invisible change which will accompany the more obvious ones will require from you a greater flexibility and, in contrast, a greater attachment to the eternal verities if we are to survive. I do not use the word "survival" in its customary sense. I use it as the preservation of the essential qualities of our civilization and not in the more usual form as a physical thing.

² BULLETIN of Feb. 6, 1961, p. 175.

It will require of you a great deal more resilience toward novelty and change than was required of your predecessors. You must shorten the time of its application as it affects your everyday life. I am sure that this will come if only because life is infinitely adjustable.

Life is the great guide and teacher. No words that I might say here or words that you read will give you the answer. You will ask it, and I know you will give it. But do not ever consider that what you have learned and understood here in Radcliffe, which has so great and real a pride in the history of education, can fully equip you for what the immediate period ahead will present to you. I envy this modern generation, not only your youth—that is always something age envies—but more for the nature of the uncertain future you face. There is little that draws upon the best in people as uncertainty. You are a generation that is called upon to act in ways we cannot at this time understand. But if, as I am sure, the education you have received here will equip you to distinguish truth from falsehood, however attractive and persuasive, and with understanding, you will bear what the future will bring with honesty, faith, and even with gaiety.

It will very possibly be grim but will most certainly be exciting. I congratulate you most sincerely on your accomplishment and wish you well in all you do and in all you face.

Czechoslovak U.N. Official Violates Status; U.S. Requests Departure

NOTE TO U.N. SECRETARY-GENERAL

U.S./U.N. press release 3734 dated June 20

JUNE 20, 1961

The United States Mission to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary General of the United Nations and, on instructions from the Department of State, wishes to bring the following facts to his attention.

On June 13 the United States Mission to the United Nations informed the Permanent Mission of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to the United Nations that the United States Government possessed irrefutable information that Mr.

Miroslav Nacvalac had engaged in activities which constituted an abuse of the privilege of his residence within the meaning of Section 13(b) of the Headquarters Agreement and requested that arrangements be made for Mr. Nacvalac's immediate departure from the United States. A copy of this note was delivered to the Secretary General on the same day.

Mr. Miroslav Nacvalac is known to the United States Government as Chief of Czechoslovak Civilian Intelligence Operations in the United States and has a long background in Czechoslovak intelligence work.

Mr. Nacvalac arrived in the United States on July 8, 1958, as a member of the Permanent Mission of Czechoslovakia to the United Nations. As of June 13, 1961, he was Counselor of that Delegation. He had earlier been in the United States as "an inspector" and as a member of the Czechoslovak Delegation to the United Nations General Assembly.

On November 3, 1958, Mr. Nacvalac travelled from New York City to pay a secret visit to Mr. Karel Hlasny, a language instructor of the Army Language School in Monterey, California. Mr. Nacvalac solicited the cooperation of Mr. Hlasny in return for an exit permit for Mr. Hlasny's fiancée, who was then in Czechoslovakia. Mr. Nacvalac informed Mr. Hlasny of code signals to be utilized in arranging future meetings, emphasizing the need for absolute secrecy.

On January 11, 1959, Mr. Nacvalac travelled to Los Angeles, California, where he met with Mr. Hlasny by previous arrangement. Mr. Nacvalac assigned Mr. Hlasny certain intelligence targets and paid him \$600. Mr. Nacvalac was particularly interested in the identities of government employees attending the Army Language School and information concerning any character weaknesses that they might possess.

On April 2, 1960, Mr. Nacvalac met Mr. Hlasny at Monterey, California; and received information from him for which he paid \$400.

Mr. Hlasny at this meeting indicated that he would not cooperate further until his fiancée was released from Czechoslovakia.

In August of 1959 Mr. Hlasny's fiancée arrived in the United States.

On November 14, 1959, Mr. Nacvalac met Mr. Hlasny at San Francisco, California, by prearrangement, paid him \$500, and received information from Mr. Hlasny.

On April 2, 1960, Mr. Nacvalac met Mr. Hlasny at San Francisco, California, in furtherance of this espionage operation.

On January 21, 1961, Mr. Nacvalac met Mr. Hlasny at San Francisco, California, paid him \$200, received information of the United States Government marked classified, and supplied Mr. Hlasny with a camera.

During his contacts with other American citizens, Mr. Nacvalac indicated an interest in discussing the possibility of defecting and remaining in the United States.

On June 13, 1961, at a meeting at the Gripsholm Restaurant in New York, the time and place of Mr. Nacvalac's choice, it became unmistakably clear that his alleged interest in remaining permanently in the United States was not motivated by sincere political convictions.

The action of the United States in requesting Mr. Nacvalac's immediate departure was based on his highly improper activities heretofore cited which had no relationship with his duties as a member of the Permanent Delegation to the United Nations. The action of the United States Government is clearly authorized under Section 13(b) of the Headquarters Agreement between the United States and the United Nations, which states that, in the case of abuse of privilege of residence by any member of any permanent delegation, it is understood that the privileges granted elsewhere in this Agreement (Section 11) shall not be construed so that such members shall be exempt from the laws and regulations of the United States regarding the residence of aliens. Mr. Nacvalac's activities clearly constitute an abuse of his privileges of residence.

In view of the fact that communications to the United Nations from the Czechoslovak Permanent Mission dated June 16, 1961, and June 19, 1961, on this subject have been circulated by the United Nations pursuant to the request of the Czechoslovak Permanent Mission, the United States Mission requests that this note be circulated to all Members of the United Nations. Circulation of its note to the Czechoslovak Permanent Mission dated June 13, 1961, a copy of which is attached,¹ is also requested.

¹ Not printed here.

NOTE TO CZECHOSLOVAK REPRESENTATIVE

Press release 421 dated June 21

JUNE 21, 1961

The United States Mission to the United Nations has the honor, upon instruction from its Government, to inform the Acting Permanent Representative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to the United Nations of the following decision taken by the Government of the United States of America.

The status accorded Miroslav Nacvalac pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(G) of the Immigration and Nationality Act by virtue of his entry into the territory of the United States of America as a member of the Permanent Mission of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to the United Nations is herewith revoked. The effect of this revocation of status is to place Miroslav Nacvalac in the category of an alien illegally in the United States of America.

Under the laws and regulations of the United States of America, Miroslav Nacvalac may elect either to depart voluntarily, or in lieu of such voluntary departure, be removed.²

U.S. Changes Procedures Governing Travel of Hungarian Officials

Press release 436 dated June 23

The U.S. Government was informed by the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic on June 21, 1961, that, effective July 1, 1961, the existing authorization requirement for travel of U.S. Government personnel in Hungary would be replaced by a procedure under which U.S. personnel may travel within Hungary upon advance notification to the Hungarian Government of the planned travel. The U.S. Government has, therefore, informed the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic that, effective July 1, 1961, personnel of the Hungarian Legation in Washington and the Hungarian Mission to the United Nations in New York may travel within the United States upon advance notification to the U.S. Government of the planned travel.

These procedures apply, as heretofore, only to travel which exceeds a radius of 25 miles from Washington or New York City or 40 kilometers from Budapest, as appropriate.

² Mr. Nacvalac left the United States on June 22.

The United Nations, First Step Toward a World Under Law

by Adlai E. Stevenson

U.S. Representative to the United Nations¹

It has become a truism to say that our world is insanely dangerous. But truisms are true, and this one is worth examining more closely. Why is our world so dangerous? Why is the path ahead of us mined at every step? If we do not grasp the nature of our peril, we are not likely to deal with it rationally and creatively. We shall be driven from crisis to crisis, reacting blindly to forces we do not control. Panic steps in, and with panic vanishes all hope of surmounting and guiding the turbulence through which we have to pass.

I think there are two dominant themes in our present predicament. One is as old as mankind, the other is wholly new; but together they spell potential disaster. The first is the collapse, in 15 brief years, of the old imperial structures which for the last hundred years at least have given some sort of order and coherence to the world. We do not regret their passing. On the contrary, our own principles of liberty and national self-determination hastened the dissolution of empires. But we must be aware of the consequences. All through history the ending of imperial rule has led to times of violence and upheaval. The freed peoples look for new political forms and allegiances. And all too often new imperialisms thrust in to take the place of the old. As Turkish power collapsed in the Balkans, the Russian empire and the Austro-Hungarian empire competed for the succession, backing local rulers and

turning local quarrels into major issues in Europe's balance of power. We know what came out of those fatal struggles—a devastating and worldwide war.

Today the ending of Europe's empires in Asia and Africa—and the ending of America's economic predominance in Latin America—has opened the way to new pressures coming from Moscow and Peiping which are none the less imperialist for their ideological disguise. All empires tend to idealize themselves. The ideal of Greek culture took Alexander to the Indies; Rome had its civilizing mission, Europe its white man's burden. Communist world brotherhood is the latest nationalization of overwhelming state power—but it can be imperialist just the same, as the people of Hungary or Tibet will testify. And its pressures are no less dangerous than those of Czarist Russia in the Balkans before 1914.

Now let us look at the other face of our peril: We cannot afford a war. The certainty of atomic destruction inhibits all the quick, brusque solutions which only a hundred years ago would have sent Russian divisions to pinch off the free salient of West Berlin—or perhaps U.S. Marines to pick off the nuisance of Castro. This caution is no doubt the only wholly good byproduct of our terrible weapons. But the risk remains. The world's posture has never seemed more warlike, and the perils of war have never been more dire.

This is the background against which we have to judge all our institutions, all our instruments, all our policies. There is really only one question to ask. Does this or that body, does this or that approach, increase or diminish the risk of war? Even the institutions in which mankind's higher hopes have been implanted must face the question

¹Address prepared for the commencement exercises at Hofstra College, Hempstead, N.Y., on June 5 (U.S./U.N. press release 3728). Ambassador Stevenson left on a special mission to South America on June 4; the address was read by John Cranford Adams, president of Hofstra College.

on this overriding issue. Even the United Nations, which, in its foundations at least, was dedicated overwhelmingly to the cause of peace, must undergo our scrutiny. We have to ask whether it is really contributing to the pacification of our world, whether its forums are really stilling passion and affording reason a chance to be heard, whether, in short, it is fulfilling or failing in its role as guardian of the peace.

The Charges of "Incoherence" and "Bias"

There are critics who are beginning strongly to question whether the United Nations, constituted as it is and behaving as it now does, can really fulfill its peacemaking function. There are, I believe, two main lines of attack, and both converge on the same point—the fact that again and again any solution of crises through the machinery of the United Nations depends upon a two-thirds vote in a world assembly now made up of 99 members and likely to pass the hundred mark at any moment. These nations represent an unbelievable variety of history, interests, experience, and maturity. Their ability to agree on any course of action is inherently limited by the immense differences in their angles of vision. Regional differences, historical differences, barriers of race and culture cross and recross the more prosaic frontiers of self-interest and national concern.

For this reason it is exceedingly difficult to secure a consensus on most issues, and the severer critics argue that to submit to such procedures not only produces incoherence in the United Nations; it exports the incoherence to the scene of operations and makes the confusion worse than might otherwise have been the case.

Nor is incoherence the gravest charge. In the last year or so it has become increasingly obvious, say the critics, that a profoundly anti-Western bias has crept into the United Nations debates. The majority of the new nations have emerged to independence out of one form or other of Western colonial control. Many of them have an instinctive bias against their ex-masters. All of them respond compulsively to anything that suggests a Western relapse into colonialism. For historical reasons they do not react with the same concern against aggressive acts by Russia or China. The African League sanctions against South Africa, but no one suggests they should be applied to Russia over its Black European tyranny. Even so re-

spected a world statesman as Mr. Nehru was slow to condemn Russian oppression in Hungary. But he was quick to denounce America's backing for the anti-Castro landings in Cuba.

How then can the Western Powers use and respect an institution whose inherent bias seems to be against them and whose members appear to apply two quite different standards of judgment—one of excuse or indifference toward the ill doings of the Communist great powers, one of loud condemnation and hostility toward the West? This surely, so the argument runs, cannot lead to peace. The United Nations is becoming a forum for a further steady undermining of the Western World, a further whittling away of any effective balance of world power.

What are we to say to these criticisms? I believe that the charge of incoherence is not borne out by the record. The United Nations has continued to evolve and maintain a policy for minimal security in the Middle East—even after the debacle at Suez. It did act in the Korean crisis. Its mediators, its control commissions, its on-the-spot investigations have held before the eyes of the world the fundamental obligation not to settle issues by force. Even the interventions which have been most resented—the bringing of Algeria before the United Nations or the discussion of the responsibilities of the colonial powers to hasten independence—may have somewhat strengthened the forces making for negotiation and away from violence.

Similarly the accusation of bias is not so straightforward as it appears. The United Nations is not responsible for the fact that most of the new nations are ex-colonial. Their anti-imperialist inclinations are simply a fact of contemporary life. The United Nations is not responsible for the fact that Russia does not seem to most peoples in Asia, Africa, or Latin America to be imperialist. This view simply reflects the fact that in Africa and Latin America Russia was not the colonial master. In Asia the spread of Russian power has been on a slow continental scale—like the spread of American power to the Pacific—and the local peoples, unlike the Bantu of South Africa or the fellahs of Algeria, have been brought very fully into the educational and economic expansion of the Soviet Union.

It may be illogical to exclude Khazaks and Uzbeks and Armenians from the ranks of people

deserving self-determination, but the United Nations did not create the distinction. It is there in the minds of the current leaders of the new nations.

An International Basis for Restoring Order

But if the bias is there, why submit disputes to the United Nations at all? It is here we have to ask the crucial question: What is the alternative? Do not forget the historical background of our day. Empires are collapsing. New power systems backed by a fanatic faith seek to take their place. Most of the disputes that come to the United Nations concern this crumbling background of pressure and counterpressure. The Congo crisis, which has brought so many of these criticisms to a head, is preeminently such a crisis. The Belgian withdrawal was followed by anarchy with which on the one hand the Belgians stepped back and on the other the Russians began to step in. In these circumstances any direct intervention by the West would have been interpreted as an attempt to reimpose colonialism. Local opinion would have swung over to support the Communists, and the West would have been left in the impossible position of fighting a guerrilla war against a background of implacable local hostility.

I need hardly underline the fact that in the little wars that mark the end of empire—and can lead to the big wars that end everything—local opinion is decisive. The British could not defeat the Communist guerrillas in Malaya until independence was a fact and the local people won over. So long as Communists claim that they are fighting imperialism, local opinion swings their way—as it did, tragically, in Cuba. It follows that direct Western interventions tend of their very nature to produce a revulsion of local feeling which threatens the effectiveness of the intervention. We cannot change this fact. A hundred years of colonialism lie behind it. Half a decade is too short in which to produce a decisive change.

The result is that in situations such as the Congo the Western World would be almost powerless if there were no United Nations force available to restore order, check a takeover by an outside power—Eastern or Western—and gradually build up the preconditions of genuine independence. Direct Western action would only hasten a Communist takeover. By putting the whole task of

restoring order onto an international basis, favoring neither East nor West, there is at least a chance of avoiding first a Western defeat and secondly the risk of spiraling war. In short, while nations cannot intervene in the internal affairs of other nations, the United Nations can.

It is surely significant that it is since the United Nations frustrated the Communists' plans of rapid infiltration in the Congo that Mr. Khrushchev has been trying to extend his veto to the whole Organization and make sure that neither the Secretary-General nor any other organ of the United Nations shall be free to act or intervene. We by the same token must support and back with all our influence the only instrument by which the end of the Western system of colonialism can be prevented from opening the doors to the new imperialism of the East.

Purposeful International Action

And this is not, I hasten to add, only a Western interest. It is above all the new nations themselves that need an impartial instrument with which to keep themselves out of the perils of great power rivalry. As President Nkrumah [of Ghana] has reminded Africa: "When the bull elephants fight, the grass is trampled down." The ability of the new nations to interpose the United Nations between their own quarrels and the great powers' struggles is their best hope of safeguarding the independence they have so urgently wanted and so recently received. Never before have emergent nations had such an instrument for their defense. Never before has the attempt been made to overcome the perils of postimperial transition by purposive international action. All the rivalries, all the dangers, all the threats are as old as empire itself. Only the United Nations is new. It alone therefore offers the hope that this time the ending of empire will not lead to general war.

But our support of the United Nations looks beyond the doubts and incoherences of this troubled year. We can hope that the passing years will make more plain the transformation of Western society from a group of colonial powers into a peaceful association of nations bent on sharing their great wealth with the developing world. As the mood changes, the pressing need for the United Nations as an instrument of pacification in the immediate postcolonial phase

will give ground to wider and more inspiring tasks. The United Nations remains and must remain the arena in which the great dialog of humanity is carried on. That dialog is too vital for us to depreciate the institution which enshrines it.

We are going through a rough period in our relations with Russia at this time. But we can recall that in the past the United Nations has been used as the venue for the negotiating of a more peaceful phase. The Berlin blockade was called off in the corridors of the United Nations. The Korean war ended under its auspices. So did the Suez crisis. Now the Congo appears to be on the way to order. We must hope and pray that similar disengagements will be possible in the future, and we must stand ready to seize the opportunities whenever they come. And they will come, I am sure, the more easily if the United Nations provides constant intercourse and maximum contact between all the powers.

Nor do I limit the vital significance of the United Nations to these pragmatic matters, important though they are. In its ultimate role the United Nations is mankind's only frail shield against the rule of brute force. We know so well what we must do if we are to avoid the horrors of nuclear destruction. We must build up in our narrow world institutions of law, of cooperation, of arbitration and back them with police power. This is how we have moved from anarchy to ordered peace inside domestic society. This is how we must proceed in the world at large. Nothing less than a world under law can be our aim in the era of the megaton bomb.

Toward this end the United Nations is a first step. Like the king's peace which in the days of Henry II covered only certain routes and certain sanctuaries, the United Nations' jurisdiction is still limited—limited by the good will of all its members, limited by the forbearance of the more powerful and the modesty and good sense of the weaker brethren.

This is not all we need. But it is something. To weaken it, to turn away from it, to leave it to its destructive antics would be the equivalent of declaring bankrupt men's best hopes for peace. This we must not do. We must not "despair of the republic"—the republic of all mankind who live in fear and long for peace and in the United Nations have at least set their foot a first step on the way to a world society under law.

Spain Waives Right To Have Two Naval Deserters Returned

Press release 481 dated June 22

The Spanish Government has informed the Department of State that it has decided to waive its right to have two Spanish naval deserters, Juan Perez Varela and Manuel Martín Prieto Alba, returned to Spain pursuant to article XXIV of the Treaty of Friendship and General Relations of 1902 between Spain and the United States.¹ The Department of State had previously acknowledged the international obligation of the United States to return the seamen at the request of the Spanish Government.

The two naval seamen deserted from Spanish naval vessels in United States ports in the spring of 1960. Considerable interest has been aroused by their case, which has been the subject of litigation in United States courts and of proposed legislation in Congress. The court decisions recognized that under the provisions of the treaty the United States Government has an obligation to return such deserters to the Spanish authorities.

The voluntary action by the Spanish Government in relinquishing its right in the case of these two naval seamen has been taken consequent to a petition to the Spanish Chief of State signed by them. It does not alter the position that the provisions of the treaty are applicable in such cases.

U.S. Aids Zanzibar Refugees

Press release 426 dated June 22

The U.S. Government is providing emergency food and medical supplies to the Government of Zanzibar to relieve suffering among the Indian Ocean island's residents made homeless as a result of recent disturbances there. Powdered milk, fruit juices, drugs, and bandages will arrive in the morning of June 23, 1961, in the port of Zanzibar City. The emergency supplies will be drawn from the stores of two U.S. Navy ships, part of the Solant Amity (South Atlantic Amity) group currently on a good-will tour of ports on Africa's east coast.

¹ 33 Stat. 2105.

A New Generation and the Future of Africa

by G. Mennen Williams

Assistant Secretary for African Affairs¹

From what I know of the dreams men share, dreams renewed and refreshed by young people like yourselves, I believe that the age-old visions of a more abundant life for all mankind give us our sense of direction today as always. They shape our work and bring us into touch with the aspirations of our closest neighbors, our national leaders, and the most remote far-distant villagers of the human brotherhood.

I feel that President Kennedy has in effect preceded me here, for the words of his inaugural address² had also to do with a "commencement" for these stirring days of 1961. He said, "I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation."

The future is two things: It is inevitable, and it is yours—it is in the hands of your generation. But it is not in your hands alone, for we must look broadly at the word "generation" and recognize the stake which youth everywhere shares with you in this inevitable future. The question is, first, what you will make of the *American* future, but the second question is already part of the first and that is: What will America do together with other peoples for the freedom and dignity of man?

I recently traveled to 16 of the countries of Africa, most of them supremely of this generation in having attained their independence only yesterday. I was tremendously impressed by the dedication of the leaders of these new countries, most of them relatively young men. They are determined to improve the life of their people despite tremendous odds—odds difficult to imagine.

How do you build a better life for peoples who may be 90 percent illiterate, racked with disease and malnutrition, divided by tribe and language, enjoying as little as \$40 per capita income each year? Indeed, it would be impossible without faith, without a stirring in the souls of the people to do their best, to be greater than themselves.

¹Address made at commencement exercises at Ferris Institute, Big Rapids, Mich., on June 11 (press release 375 dated June 9).

²BULLETIN of Feb. 6, 1961, p. 175.

The young people of Africa share this vision of human uplift. This is their future. It is an extraordinary and noble challenge, in which we are called upon to share as greatly as we can.

Education is seen as the key that will unlock the African future. For this, no sacrifice seems too great. Students walk hundreds of miles to school, go to neighboring countries to work, sacrifice almost beyond imagination to secure a college education. Communities construct school buildings with voluntary labor at their own expense, as we did in America's frontier days, so that their young people can enjoy this new opportunity. This is the spirit in many parts of Africa today.

All this reminds me of Ferris Institute, which was organized as an opportunity school to provide the benefits of education to boys and girls who worked on the farms and in the mines and forests of the Upper Peninsula. The young people caught the spirit of the opportunity thus offered them and came here determined to equip themselves for a full life in the service of their communities and their State.

If we look with some pride at what Ferris Institute has done for the people of Michigan, we are, in so doing, measuring one of the great needs of Africa. You have helped equip this wonderful State with the vital skills that have advanced us to the front rank in the technological development and productive capacity of America. You have been a widely noted model in this, and such achievement is among the models which motivate the eager new generation in much of the world, and surely in Africa.

During my trip I was delighted to be able to visit the University of Nigeria, in the company of the distinguished African nationalist leader who is now Governor General of Nigeria, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe. Dr. Azikiwe, incidentally, received his education in America and has an encyclopedic knowledge of our history and its great documents, which he quotes with great fondness and special relish to American visitors, perhaps to help make sure we will not underrate the tremendous vitality and meaning of our heritage in the greater world. What made this visit so rewarding was that Michigan State University has had a direct hand, in cooperation with our Government aid program, in bringing this brand new, bustling Nigerian university to life.

I had a further pleasure, in the city of Ibadan

in western Nigeria, of visiting a vocational school which is being developed by Western Michigan University.

Elsewhere on my trip I was constantly reminded of the boon which education is to those who hunger for it, who have a true and urgent need and use for it, but woefully little chance—boy for boy and girl for girl—of assuaging that hunger. An incident at the airport in Mogadiscio, in the Somali Republic, which forms the tip of the great Horn of Africa, is symbolic. There, as at every stop on our trip, we were greeted by high government officials with some ceremony. All at once the proceedings were interrupted by the appearance of a young Somali in work clothes, who rushed up to me and demanded, "Where is my scholarship?" We did not travel with scholarships, but we did look into this young man's request.

The Story of Legson Kayira

There is another example of which you may have read. This is the case of a penniless African boy with strong legs and a wonderful determination, by the name of Legson Kayira. In October of 1958, with only a dream and those strong legs to go on, he bid his mother and brothers goodbye in their village in Nyasaland and set out "to go to school in the United States." He walked 2,000 miles through Tanganyika, Uganda, and the Sudan, stopping on the way at U.S. Information Service libraries. At one of them he picked up the catalog of Skagit Junior College in the State of Washington and wrote applying for a scholarship. The college granted it promptly, and with the help of Americans there and in Africa, Legson Kayira's airplane ticket and promises of food and housing were provided. Last December, 2 years after he began this journey into the future, this young African—who is not quite sure of his age, but thinks it is between 18 and 20—arrived in the United States.

This much you may recall reading. I would like to add something now to the story, taken from a letter written by Legson Kayira to one of the Americans who helped him reach his destination. He wrote:

Allow me to thank you for your great kindness. Never in my whole life saw I such kindness as you and so many other Americans possess. All my tireds are off because the Statue of Liberty says "Give me your tired . . ." and I have given him.

I arrived just yesterday. People were awaiting me at the Seattle Airport and I was driven to Skagit some seventy miles. At the college I was warmly welcomed and a coffee was served in my honor. On first seeing the college, I loved it. It is wonderfully beautiful. The people around here like all true Americans are very generous and willing to help. It seems to me that they were created for the purpose of helping the poor as well as the rich; for their help is not selective.

I really enjoyed my stay in Washington, D.C., and I hope to see you there again, but the time is only known to Him that makes it. I am now busy adjusting myself to this new way of life. It will take me a long time to rise from the pit of ignorance to the top of civilization, but I am not very much frightened.

God bless you, in your undertakings, helping the education pilgrims on their way to the land of knowledge.

Here is a strong, generous, and challenging picture of America's meaning for the less favored peoples of the world. Not all youngsters in Nyasaland or other parts of Africa have Legson Kayira's vision—and stamina. But a great many harbor the same inner desire and are anxious to lift themselves up for service to their struggling nations, and to sacrifice to do so. In a concluding paragraph of his letter, Legson Kayira wrote:

I shall try my very best, so that hundreds or thousands of my friends now home come over here for their higher studies.

Freedom Is Indivisible

This image of America is our strength, our greatness. It is also our obligation, yours and mine, private citizen and public servant—the obligation to respond to what others expect of us. Do they expect too much? Can we live up to such expectations? What will it cost to help as we are asked to help?

The answer to these questions depends on how we reply to another. That is, do we accept that freedom is for us today the great cause that it was at America's founding and in her greatest times ever since, and that freedom is indivisible? If this tradition lives in your hearts today, if the answer is yes—that freedom is indivisible—then you will know that we cannot fail to multiply and magnify that readiness to help which a few Americans gave to the dreams of a brave African boy. If this means hard work and sacrifices for us, too, let us find how to persist and glory in a task that supports so great a cause as freedom.

From where I sit as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, it seems to me that the kind of world our children and grandchildren will have is

going to depend upon whether we can assist the emerging nations of Africa to realize the full meaning of human dignity, to build political institutions of freedom, to earn a decent standard of living, banishing the old enemies of ignorance, poverty, disease, and tyranny. Because of lost opportunities of education and experience, Africa must look to the rest of the world not only for capital but for technical aid—teachers, doctors, professional people of all kinds, along with artisans and experts in all the middle skills, and men and women who can teach them. This may be where some of you can help. We need as many of you as are qualified and ready to join in one or another form of this foreign service to your country.

But the strength of America, its ability to lead, is challenged on this continent as well as elsewhere in the world. We cannot exert world leadership unless we can put our own house in order. We must, for example, harness automation for the benefit of mankind so that it will produce abundance and not unemployment. We must see that the wonders of medicine are at the service of all and that poverty as well as disease are rolled back. We must see that men and women can find self-fulfillment in art and culture and the wonders of nature as well as in productive and satisfying labor. And at every step of this road there is a challenge for all of us in every American city and country village.

Today we are especially reminded that courage, dedication, good sense, and deep understanding are needed in every walk of our society. Freedom and human dignity are on trial in every corner of our land. A recent report challenges residential integration in the suburbs of the North, and bus riders test equal opportunity in the South.

It will not be sufficient that President Kennedy can scale the heights of greatness, as he surely will, or that other leaders in our Government can rise to national crises. The struggle for human decency, the deeds of heroism, the acts of gentleness and human understanding must take place in every corner of this land and in every part of our society if we are going to be worthy of the challenge of our times.

On his return from Europe, President Kennedy reported of his meetings in Vienna that they conveyed a somber mood. This, he said, "simply demonstrated how much work we in the free world have to do and how long and hard a struggle must

be our fate as Americans in this generation as the chief defenders of the cause of liberty."³

However you reckon your future in the world, wherever your place in it may be, you have a call to greatness, as flesh and blood of the United States of America, as individuals in your offices and homes, your fields and churches.

Today you are finishing one challenge and turning to new ones. You have been put to the test, and you already sense something of your strength. Meeting your new challenges will, I feel certain, bring you your greatest joys and satisfactions.

I am convinced each one of you has before you a life of opportunity, of fulfillment, of dedicated service. You have before you your happiest days. May the Good Lord inspire you and walk with you every step of the way.

Immigration Quota Established for Sierra Leone

A PROCLAMATION¹

WHEREAS under the provisions of section 202(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, each independent country, self-governing dominion, mandated territory, and territory under the international trusteeship system of the United Nations, other than independent countries of North, Central, and South America, is entitled to be treated as a separate quota area when approved by the Secretary of State; and

WHEREAS under the provisions of section 201(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, jointly, are required to determine the annual quota of any quota area established pursuant to the provisions of section 201(a) of the said Act, and to report to the President the quota of each quota area so determined; and

WHEREAS under the provisions of section 202(e) of the said Act, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, jointly, are required to revise the quotas, whenever necessary, to provide for any political changes requiring a change in the list of quota areas; and

WHEREAS, the former British Colony and Protectorate of Sierra Leone became independent on April 27, 1961; and

WHEREAS the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General have jointly determined and reported to me the immigration quota hereinafter set forth:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, JOHN F. KENNEDY, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of

¹ *Ibid.*, June 26, 1961, p. 991.

³ No. 3417; 26 *Fed. Reg.* 5387.

the authority vested in me by the aforesaid Act of Congress, do hereby proclaim and make known that the annual quota of the quota area hereinafter designated has been determined in accordance with the law to be, and shall be, as follows:

Quota Area	Quota
Sierra Leone	100

The establishment of an immigration quota for any quota area is solely for the purpose of compliance with the pertinent provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act and is not to be considered as having any significance extraneous to such purpose.

Proclamation No. 3298 of June 3, 1959, entitled "Immigration Quotas,"² is amended by the addition of the immigration quota established by this proclamation.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this twelfth day of June in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred [SEAL] and sixty-one and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-fifth.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

By the President:
DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

87th Congress, 1st Session

Structure and Functions of the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State. Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. March 21, 1961. 39 pp.

United Nations Operations in the Congo. Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. April 13, 1961. 28 pp.

Section-by-Section Analysis of Proposed Foreign Assistance Bill. A bill to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic and social development and internal and external security, and for other purposes. June 9, 1961. 43 pp. [Committee print]

Amendment to Charter of International Finance Corporation. Report to accompany H.R. 6765. H. Rept. 501. June 12, 1961. 4 pp.

Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. Report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. S. Rept. 372. June 14, 1961. 44 pp.

Free Entry of Electron Microscopes. Report to accompany H.R. 3385. H. Rept. 546. June 16, 1961. 2 pp.

Caribbean Organization. Report to accompany H.J. Res. 384. S. Rept. 440. June 21, 1961. 4 pp.

² For text, see BULLETIN of July 6, 1959, p. 19.

A New Birth of Freedom

by Joseph S. Farland
*Ambassador to Panama*¹

The President of the United States has asked me, as his personal representative, to convey to you his best wishes for the success of the 70th convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs and to express his gratification and commendation for your choice of a program emphasizing international matters, a program which should assist in creating greater understanding between nations and peoples. This I am delighted to do.

At the same time I would like to tell you how greatly honored I am that your federation has afforded me the occasion to meet with you this evening. It is a privilege for which I am most grateful because it presents a challenging opportunity to discuss certain serious international problems that confront our great Nation. Would that my subject could be one of levity or in a lighter vein, but time and events negate that possibility. Serious are the international problems, and the welfare and future of us all are cardinally related to the decisions necessitated by these problems—decisions that are not subject to postponement. This you know, but it should be reiterated since you as a federation are the largest group of organized women in the world; being such, it is patently necessary that you continue to recognize the vast power for good which you possess and the need to continue full exercise of that power.

There is much truth in the belief that the destiny of the world will be determined even more by the decisions of the women of the Americas than at the conference tables of the world's political and military powers. Thus, I would be derelict to the occasion if I failed to stress the tremendous influence which you individually and as a federation exert, not only in our homes but also in local, national, and international affairs. And it is necessary to recognize that such influence is accompanied by heavy responsibility, since it involves a resultant direct relationship with the formulation of those decisions. What you do or do not do will continue to influence markedly and decisively all facets of our democratic way of life. Now, more than ever before, your role is of maximum im-

¹ Address made before the General Federation of Women's Clubs, at Miami Beach, Fla., on June 8 (press release 372).

portance—your role is vital. This is why I feel it particularly opportune to discuss tonight areas in which you can effect important contributions; to review some of the problems and dangers that threaten our basic principles of social, economic, and governmental relations, which, in turn, affect the peace we strive for in this world; and, in part, to give you an accounting of how our Government is channeling and conducting its activities in furtherance of these selfsame democratic principles as related to the country to which I am accredited as your Ambassador—the Republic of Panama.

Woman's Increasing Role in America's Development

Since the very genesis of our Nation women have helped in multiple ways to mold and strengthen the sinews of America. As homemakers, the loving care and training given their children have been fruitful in the growth and well-being of the individual, the community, and the Nation. As teachers, they have instilled the ideals of good citizenship in millions of our children during their most formative years in elementary schools and high schools and, year by year, have assumed increasing responsibility in whetting and satisfying the eager intellectual curiosity of the tidal wave of students overflowing in our colleges and universities.

Women participate as never before in the civic affairs of the Nation, judiciously exercising their hard-won right to vote. Thus they keep faith with that small group of women—and, to keep the record straight, a few men—who met at Seneca Falls, New York, in July 1848 “to discuss the social, civil, and religious conditions and rights of woman.” From the ideas expressed at that historic meeting grew the woman's suffrage movement which did, indeed, so mightily move public opinion that our Constitution was amended 72 years later to guarantee woman's right to express her political preferences with the ballot.

Not only do women now hold with distinction large numbers of high-ranking administrative positions in local, State, and Federal agencies, but also they hold many important seats in our Nation's legislative bodies and enjoy increasing representation in its various judicial systems. The United States has been ably represented by its women who have served as delegates, advisers, and technical consultants at dozens of international conferences and in crucially important

posts at the United Nations. Our Foreign Service has many women career officers who are just as competent, just as dedicated, as any man. And the wives of the officers of an embassy often are as important as their husbands in the sometimes touchy task of maintaining friendly relations with countries all over the globe.

The women of the United States more and more are turning their inquiring minds toward every field of science in industrial, government, and university laboratories. Medicine has benefited not only from their talents but also from their instinctive tenderness. It is significant recognition of woman's ability in this field that a woman physician watches over the health of our President. More than 22 million women have taken their place in the total work force engaged in commerce and industry, stimulating the economic growth of our country. They help produce the innumerable goods and services that are needed to maintain, above and beyond our incomparable standard of living, the security of the free world. In all the fields of arts and culture, the women of the United States have shown a great variety of natural gifts, winning national and international fame for their accomplishments.

In retrospect, the most amazing fact in this long list of achievements by the American woman is that she has never surrendered her primary role as a homemaker. She has instead, through hardship, sacrifice, and often heroic effort, from the time of the colonial pioneers to the present day, expanded her horizons of service to include not only her own family but also her neighbors near and far, her community, her country, and the world. She works for her loved ones and for people she may never meet in lands she may never see. Therein lies her spiritual greatness and the fulfillment of her duty and destiny as a woman.

In all faith and all reverence I believe that this pattern of development which, as a way of life, came into being in this hemisphere, this dedication of devotion by its women in companionship with its men from the earliest period of settlement, is part of a providential design. Let us never forget that not only our country but also every other one of the American family of nations which share so many bonds in common was founded by men and women who believed in God and sought to live in accordance with His laws. There is no other great group of nations in the

world of which it can be said—and it is most truly said of the American peoples—that at the very moment of their entrance on the visible stage of history they thanked God for having brought them thus far and sought His guidance for all their future. In every one of our American Republics—whether the first settlers were Catholic or Protestant, whether they spoke English, Spanish, French, or Portuguese—the little group that landed to found a dwelling place and a homeland knelt devoutly in that prayer of thanksgiving and petition for blessing. That repeated act of faith and prayer was most moving, most significant.

Challenges of an Uncertain Decade

Mankind has survived many critical periods in the centuries past, but there is good reason to believe that not since the Dark Ages has there existed a world situation so replete with danger as the present. The cold war is an inescapable influence on every facet of our lives, and the threat of total all-out war is constantly with us. Throughout much of the world mankind is viewing political and social disruption and in some instances stark chaos. Many millions of our fellow men not only lack the barest necessities of life, but—what is most tragic—even more are filled with utter despair. The astounding progress of modern science, publicized in its reach for the stars, has accentuated the crisis by making possible the total destruction of mankind. The development of transportation and communication facilities has tended to bring into more dangerous rivalry the divided ends and purposes of man. We have been brought closer together physically—only to disagree.

Caught up in the backwash which followed World War I, the timid and weak sought temporary shelter in one tyranny or another. The politically indifferent were prone to permit abjectly the erosion of their political values and of their principles. Many of those who believed in human rights and personal liberties faltered in their faith. And the powerful and violent imposed their tyrannies in the name of freedom. As the result of this degeneration, the world finds itself morassed in political and ideological conflict. Small wonder then that we must rally to the support of our leaders and help them plan and implement the new policies and programs to meet the immense challenges of the times in which we are privileged

to live and to serve. I would like to pinpoint for you those challenges that will most profoundly affect our lives and security in this uncertain decade.

The first is, without doubt, the rapid emergence of new nations, sometimes explosively, from the fast-shrinking areas of old colonial domination. A surgetide of national independence is sweeping over many lands and may not recede until perhaps a minimum of 120 sovereign states shall make up the community of nations. Varied are the reasons giving impetus to this nationalistic outbreak, but interwoven repetitiously through the pattern is the quest for freedom, nationally and individually, and the yearning for economic and social betterment. These are the self-same forces that galvanized the 13 tiny colonies to Herculean action, that modeled our national heritage. It is well to remember that, most certainly, the Boston Tea Party was not a festive society get-together. Will these new states choose democratic freedom, or will they succumb to totalitarian communism? The final choice necessarily must be theirs. But an enlightened American policy of economic and social assistance can be an important factor in their decision. Here then is a crucial decision, for it will shape the foreseeable future of our civilization.

The second important challenge is the unabating hostility of the Sino-Soviet Communist bloc to the nations of the free world. This totalitarian bloc poses a worldwide threat and particularly a threat to the emerging nations which face the possibility of being victimized by a more terrible form of colonialism than they have ever known or imagined.

There are several choices open to us. We can work hard and do all within our power to convince the developing nations that democracy and the rapid economic growth they need to survive go hand in hand. Or, at the other end of the spectrum, we can stand by and let the newer nations sample the promises of a Communist society and discover for themselves the cruel emptiness of these promises, with all the human destruction this entails.

To cloud the issue Soviet imperialists speak of "peaceful coexistence" between the free world and that which lies in bondage behind the Iron Curtain. The meaning of these words is clear. It is the slogan under which the 20th-century Communist imperialism aims to conquer the world with-

out risking general war. Former independent states, with long and illustrious histories, forcibly subjugated by the Sino-Soviet bloc are tragic reminders of this process. It is these peoples, such as the Hungarians, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Tibetans, to cite but a few, who can eloquently testify about the real meaning of "peaceful coexistence." These people have not only been forcibly deprived of rights of sovereignty; they have lost the inalienable rights of freedom to which all peoples of the world, regardless of race, creed, or color, aspire; they have had taken from them those inalienable rights which democracy champions—life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, the worth of the individual, and his endowment with human dignity.

We speak much of human rights and personal liberty, even as we are witness today to so many evidences of man's degradation of man. And we must ask ourselves, in the light of conflicting testimony, from whence we obtain the concept of the dignity and worth of human nature. Some, perhaps a majority, would reply that this has come as a rationale of the sociologist, the philosopher, the statesman, but the answer for validity must go deeper: The worth of human personality is the gift of our Creator, who has called us to be His children. Take out of our national life the worship and service to God, take out every conception of the divine within humanity, all that we mean by the soul, and you have devitalized democracy. Without God, political idealism by itself cannot survive. That is why Lenin in 1913 dogmatically stated that "Every religious idea, every idea of a god, even flirting with the idea of God is unutterable vileness . . . of the most dangerous kind, 'contagion' of the most abominable kind. Millions of sins, filthy deeds, acts of violence and physical contagions . . . are far less dangerous than the subtle, spiritual idea of a god decked out in the smartest 'ideological costumes.'" The symbol of the Cross or the symbol of the hammer and sickle—it is under these symbols that we must not only cast our vote but cast our lives.

The third staggering challenge is more closely tied to the physical survival of our world. It is posed by the terrible destructive power of the thermonuclear weapons, the missiles systems that deliver them, and the increasing membership in the so-called "nuclear club." After World War II our Nation demobilized to the point where it

possessed not one division, not one air group ready for combat. Our democracy's deep reluctance to maintain a military establishment in time of peace gave rise to danger through weakness. We are squarely on the horns of a great dilemma. It would be sheer folly not to develop the arms and military forces needed to deter every kind of Communist aggression. Yet it would be equally foolhardy not to urge on the world a policy of arms control to reduce the dangers to civilization of thermonuclear warfare. Logic and the ultimate survival of humanity demand that the United States and the Soviet Union come to an agreement in this crucial area of their many differences—but an effective one, not one simply to reach an agreement. The problem of disarmament would be simple if the political issues could be resolved. Answerability for the breakdown of the thermonuclear control conferences to date is solely Russia's responsibility, solely Russia's intransigency.

U.S. Answer to Communist Imperialism

We must be willing to deal with those challenges in the traditionally active and resourceful ways of our forefathers. There is every indication that we will continue to do just that. In his already classic inaugural address,² President John F. Kennedy inspired millions of Americans to action and millions of our friends abroad to hope, when he said:

Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

The entire address should be read and reread by all of us, for it is America's virile answer to Communist exploitation of national weakness and human misery for its expansionist ends. It is our Nation's answer to communistic imperialism—imperialism on a scale unknown to the Caesars. Can the leaders of the Communist world doubt that we were all as one with the President when he expressed our singleness of purpose in these phrases?

² BULLETIN of Feb. 6, 1961, p. 175.

Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

Now that our purpose has been stated in language that no aggressor can misunderstand, how are we to wage this very hot cold war? I endorse the ideas of General David Sarnoff, who more than 5 years ago warned us that, "For Moscow, the real alternative to a nuclear showdown is not 'peace' but political-psychological warfare of a magnitude to weaken, demoralize, chip away and ultimately take over what remains of the free world." He strongly urged "that we renounce all delusions of easy solutions and compromises; that instead we mount a political counter-strategy as massive, as intensive and as clear about its ultimate goals as the strategy of the enemy itself." Thus our moral and physical strength should take the bold initiative and be brought to bear in full measure on Communist-created crises before they can wreak their planned havoc on the free world. We can no longer surrender our freedom in precious bits and pieces for the fool's gold of temporarily relaxed tensions and the false security of coexistence offered by those who boast they will bury us.

One of the clearest and most present dangers we face is allowing those among us who have become the proponents of a cold-war *status quo* to lull us into not making our best, our urgently needed, efforts vigorously to defend and extend the heritage of our free society to those who hunger for its benefits. They are those who argue that a poor peace is preferable to any war. They are the timid, grasping at the broken straws of illusionary security, struggling to keep alive the disappearing old order of things. These straws, one by one, are either being blown away by the healthy winds of long-pent-up demands for human justice or are wilting before the insidious, miasmic emanations of international communism.

This head-in-the-sand view with regard to the present revolutionary world situation is completely at odds with logic and reality. Refusing to face our responsibilities with strong national purpose and determination can only lead us to the ignominious sacrifice of so many of our ideals that the very survival of our system of government will be put in grave doubt. We cannot deny the sacred principles of our hard-won democracy by such craven, creeping surrender to those who

seek our downfall. Let us not speak of defending the *status quo* until the world has a firm, unalterable peace won on our democratic terms and enjoyed by everyone everywhere.

The bold and energetic restatement of our historic image as champions and defenders of liberty everywhere, I repeat, has been made in tough, clear, and unmistakable language by our President. Action, strength, and sacrifice must be the keynotes of our national life and our foreign policy in this decade of daring dedication. We give them gladly in the sobering realization that a reluctance to act would make a mockery of free-world leadership and would sicken the hearts of those millions yet enslaved by Iron Curtains, false doctrines, disease, ignorance, hunger, and hopeless poverty.

Events in Cuba

Let us consider a situation close to all of us in the United States—very close at hand, indeed, here in Miami. The course of events in Cuba daily emphasizes the stark loss of freedom to the people of that freedom-loving nation and underlines the threat to the Americas posed by the Communist-dominated Castro regime, aligned with and supported by the Sino-Soviet bloc. The cause of freedom is coincident with the destinies of humanity; consequently, the temporary loss of freedom by the Cuban people to a tyrannical and dictatorial police state, which now bears the outward semblance of Cuba but not its noble and valiant spirit, constitutes a tragedy not only for Cubans but for mankind.

The initial setback of the Cuban people in the fight to regain their freedom has succeeded in further identifying the tyranny for what it is—a ruthless Communist dictatorship. Therein, at least, the effort of these patriots has not been wholly in vain. The issue is now clearly delineated for even those who formerly did not wish to see: At stake is the survival of human liberty in the Americas, and on this issue each of us—every one of us as free individuals, each one of our countries as free peoples—must take our stand.

With a well-established Communist beachhead in the heart of our hemisphere and with continued onslaught of Communist imperialism everywhere else, the nations of the Americas and of the free world must continue to build and strengthen bonds

of alliance and friendship and must together rededicate themselves to those principles which we hold to be essential truths as we face today's inescapable choice. Russia may have been the first to free man from the forces of gravity, but the United States was the first to free man from despotism. And it is significant that even in a space probe the free world's first astronaut controlled the direction of his flight and thus, in this sense, the course of his destiny.

New Motivations for Women of Latin America

For your attention tonight I wish to present an observation which for the most part heretofore has gone unstated. In enunciating this observation I do so as a reporter. The idea is not mine; it is an idea indigenous to the area in which I serve and is being promulgated by those who are counterpart to you. It is true that there are in all of Latin America forces in motion and counterplay—forces as subtle as an idea posed by innuendo, forces as brutal and tyrannic as the mob cry of *paredón*. The women of Latin America, far from being immune to the political, social, and economic changes that are developing, are becoming acutely conscious of their secondary role through the centuries past and in contraposition are developing an awareness to the challenge of today and tomorrow, a determination to assume positive and active participation in current events which affect their home and their nation. Within expanding realms of interest these women are determined to become more influential in the formulation of decisions—local, national, and international—which will have a marked bearing upon the future courses of events.

What I am reporting in no wise minimizes the great and significant contributions already made by the women of Latin America to the total life of their countries, both in colonial times and in the not-too-distant past. Women have been particularly prominent in many pioneer movements in this hemisphere. In the difficult period of colonization four women in Latin America ruled as governors—Isabel, the wife of Hernando de Soto, whom he left in Cuba as acting governor when he set out on his last expedition; Catalina Montejó, who governed in Yucatán after her father's death; Beatriz, the wife of Alvarado, Conquistador of Guatemala, who assumed the governorship when her husband was slain in battle; and Brites de

Albuquerque, who governed an important province of Brazil in the 16th century. During the present century, as a matter of fact, Latin women have served in more and varied cabinet roles than have the women of the United States; and the proportion of women who have assumed the duties of city government far exceeds that of the United States.

But what is really exciting and vibrant, what is really impelling and forceful, is that a change in custom and emphasis is pulsating through the social complex. Women no longer are satisfied with the legacy of a negative or at best passive approach to the social, political, and economic factors which affect their lives and the lives of those they love. They are looking for new spiritual and moral antecedents, and new directives, upon which to base a way of life as well as the establishment of new norms, both political and economic. With greater devotion and increased recognition of the importance of religion in their lives, they no longer feel that, in support of their church and its moral teachings, they should be the principal representative of the family at a time when the church, as never before, requires total participation of all the family. They are determined to bring new emphasis and allegiance to the home and to the family unit which will have far-reaching effects on past social practices. Thus, perforce, they can no longer observe as spectators the interplay of political activity—good, bad, or indifferent—that has flowed willy-nilly about them, for theirs is an interest motivated not by materialism or by self-aggrandizement but rather by principles of morality, by love of family, by concern for the best in their national heritage. In essence this is a new birth of freedom; this is a force to be reckoned with: Democracy can underestimate this movement only to its loss; communism can ignore this movement only at its peril.

Worldwide Responsibility of American Women

I spoke before of the responsibility that goes hand in hand with your influence as effective opinion molders and full participants in the democratic processes that characterize our national and international affairs. If for no other reason, your responsibility is worldwide because you are an international organization, but, irrespective of this, your responsibility of necessity would be international even though the organization were solely provincial.

Your forthcoming international convention in Rio de Janeiro presents an excellent opportunity further to promulgate your program of service. The seminars on the "Participation of Women in Public Affairs" which will be held in other Latin American Republics after the convention can inspire thousands of women there to effective civic action. Impatient with the continuing inability of their men to accomplish the change by themselves, they possess the energy, desire, and ability to heal the deep wounds in their social structure. I repeat, they are hungering to speed up the social and economic evolution with which they are now identified. I strongly urge that every attempt be made to fully assist the women of Latin America in this movement which is under way.

Further, I suggest that you continue to inform yourselves as completely as you can of your Nation's problems at home and abroad. The dynamics of bold, constructive action is the constructive criticism born of informed public opinion. You must find and devote more time to analyzing the statements of the world's leaders and the import of the dizzying succession of events that daily change the international situation; this you owe to yourselves and to your country. You must bring an understanding of this world into your homes. May I also suggest that at some free moment each day you ask yourself what you, you personally, have done to assist our Nation in its struggle to keep alive the principles of freedom and human rights? By daily dedication you can institute a chain reaction of incalculable force and benefit. You collectively are about 5 million strong; however, not only as an organization but as individuals you represent a force, believe me, far beyond your own calculation. When you wonder what you as one person, or your local club as one small hometown group, can do, it is well to remember that a very few dedicated disciples 2,000 years ago spread a Gospel that changed the basic concepts of man's relationship with man and showed him the path to God. Ideas, and dedication to those ideas, not only can be but are the strongest of all forces in today's struggle.

A crusade—a really viable crusade—is needed again to redefine and reaffirm our concepts of human rights and human values; and in this crusade I suggest the imperative need to bear in mind that principle which must be an integral part of

our daily lives and a continuing guide for all governments that cherish freedom and whose people worship God. It is the thesis that emphasizes the God-given origin of man, that stresses the dignity of the individual, that spells out the individual's personal value to society, that acknowledges his basic and inalienable rights as a member of society. In the harsh light of the many dangers that today face the United States in its role as the leader and the hope of those who cherish liberty, you can have no greater responsibility. It is time to face up to the fact that the wages of ignorance and complacency can only be a disastrous national defeat followed by the loss of freedom for ourselves and those we defend.

The bitter seeds of Old World feudalism in Latin America have continued to germinate into the present, concentrating wealth and political power in the hands of a few and thereby denying the just aspirations and great expectations of the humble masses for a better life. Here again your opportunity is clear, your interest could not be more opportune. You must share with these women what you have learned from your own experience so that they also may successfully organize their human material resources to break the bonds of ignorance and hunger that now oppress too many of their fellow citizens. Your accomplishments, to which I rendered tribute at the start of my remarks, can be their beacon pointing to the fulfillment of the difficult tasks they have set for themselves, accomplishments which can be their passport to full participation in the solution of 20th-century problems which has too long been frustrated by 18th-century social and economic thinking.

The Situation in Panama

In spite of the achievements and progress of a people whom I greatly admire, Panama, too, has been the victim of social and economic stultification irrespective of a close and special relationship to the United States, which relationship produced the Panama Canal, an engineering miracle of incalculable benefit to the whole world. It is only too obvious to those who live in or pass through the Republic, as many of your own members will soon do, that her social and economic development has not kept pace with the patent prosperity reflected by the high standard of living enjoyed by United States citizens in the Canal Zone. Publi-

cized though this situation has been, the applicable test is the real or fundamental needs of the people and the ability of their Government to meet those needs. When such needs, brought about by population increase or otherwise, cannot be met, the stage is set for communistic agitation. In addressing his nation last October President Roberto F. Chiari noted the danger which arises from such a situation when he stated:

The imbalance between the increase in needs and the available means to satisfy them is the primary cause of the economic, social and political disorders in underdeveloped countries such as Panama. When these convulsions reach a critical stage they also lead the masses—out of despair because of the absence of peremptory remedies—to fall for the illusory promises of agitators seeking to establish totalitarian regimes.

But I can assure you that, devoted as it is to the ideals of freedom and development, the Republic of Panama and the United States have taken joint positive action to prevent the germs of communism from breeding on the human misery born of social and economic imbalances on the social scale. Both President Kennedy and President Chiari are bringing into play dynamic programs whose unswerving basic spirit is sincere concern for human dignity in all its facets. Certainly the brightest and perhaps the last and best hope for progress in the area through democratic process is President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress³—*Alianza para el Progreso*—a new program of massive assistance to all hemisphere nations willing to institute internal reforms and initiate self-help projects of immediate benefit to their less fortunate citizens. In conformance with the objectives of the Alliance for Progress, President Chiari has stated repeatedly Panama's awareness of an imperative need for self-help and internal reform. Consequently he has undertaken the mobilization of basic resources toward that end and has begun the promulgation of fundamental reforms in taxation, in education, in public health, and in low-income housing.

The keystone of President Kennedy's 10-year program is the Act of Bogotá.⁴ In accordance with our pledge, Congress has authorized, and the President less than 3 weeks ago signed, an act providing some \$500 million as a Latin American

social development fund to be administered primarily by the Inter-American Development Bank. And it is important for us to remember that the spirit and philosophy of the Act of Bogotá and the program flowing from it spring from the Latin Americans themselves. The act was conceived and devised by them. This transcendental hemispheric agreement will bring rapid improvements in rural living and land use, housing and community facilities, educational systems and training facilities, public health, and the mobilization of domestic resources. Consequently your embassy's usual diplomatic functions in Panama—and I know this is also true of our embassies in the other Republics—have been augmented by the duties and activities necessary to encourage locally the adoption of the psychology underlying the act and to assist in field implementation of its objectives.

Experts in the various Panamanian Government ministries are readying the presentation of urgent self-help projects that will be in addition to the many programs of technical assistance already being carried out by our wide-ranging International Cooperation Administration. The entire gamut of human activity, from basic agricultural development and highway construction right down to nursing education and disease control, is benefiting from the cooperative efforts of the two Governments and their proud, freedom-loving people.

United States citizens abroad are all—and always—representatives of their country. I am proud to say that in Panama the community of our fellow citizens there is doing an excellent job in furthering United States-Panamanian relations, and multitudinous are the examples of this in charitable, social, recreational, and cultural work. Not only the United States Government but also private institutions each year provide scholarship opportunities for higher studies by Panamanian teachers and students. American private investment capital continues to play an important role in developing new industries and jobs, stimulating Panama's economic growth.

The very fine CARE organization supplies nourishing food to the needy and helps fill the huge gap in scarce school and laboratory equipment. CARE provides a precious daily milk ration to over 100,000 Panamanian school children. I am gratefully aware of your federation's cooperation with CARE in providing to 22 schools in the Gulf of Montejó area a series of kits to brighten the lives of the children and improve their health.

³ For texts of an address by President Kennedy and a message to Congress, see *ibid.*, Apr. 3, 1961, p. 471.

⁴ For text, see *ibid.*, Oct. 3, 1960, p. 537.

This area has had little development of its agricultural, educational, and medical facilities. The schoolteacher generally provides the only available medical assistance, even to the taking of blood specimens for malarial infections. The medical aid kit will be invaluable. The classroom supplies, physical education, and needle trade materials will be greeted with joy by children who may own only one shirt or dress, have never used a real baseball bat or glove, and who share the treasured stub of a pencil to write their lessons on scraps of old envelopes or wrapping paper. The tools in the resettlers' kit will help them keep back the jungle growth from the school area and maintain a garden. With all my heart I commend you for this generous gesture which will show the humble people of the Montejo area that, although society may have long neglected them, it has never forgotten that they too are precious members of the world community. As a result of this and for many other reasons you can be assured that a host of friends are looking forward to seeing those of you who will visit Panama in July.

I can think of no more fitting way to close my remarks tonight than by urging you to rededicate your efforts to bring to fruition the challenge enunciated by your President, Mrs. [E. Lee] Oz-birn, in her stirring inaugural address on June 17, 1961, when she said:

This moment together we pick up the pen to write the history of the General Federation in the first two years of this exciting, exacting decade. Ours is the challenge to write our most significant record. As you will it, so will it be!

Yes, so will it be; and you pursue this task with the proud knowledge that you have proven equal to every other challenge in the illustrious record of service to our country and to humanity. With God's help, with an unconquerable spirit, I am confident that you will attain your goals now set and in so doing serve Him, in truth, as an instrument of His peace.

New Foreign Aid Program To Place Greater Emphasis on Cooperatives

Henry R. Labouisse, Director of the International Cooperation Administration, announced on June 23 (press release 432) that greater emphasis on development and assistance of cooperatives in underdeveloped countries will be among the major

objectives of the administration's new foreign aid program.

Mr. Labouisse is also chairman of the President's Task Force on Economic Assistance, which drew up plans for the proposed consolidated and reorganized foreign aid program,¹ the Agency for International Development (AID).

He announced that ICA has already initiated a full-scale review of its cooperative assistance programs and will seek the guidance of other Government and non-Government agencies. The study is aimed at evaluating ICA's cooperative activities of the past, developing a policy statement for guidance to field missions regarding encouragement of the cooperative approach, and outlining a specific action program for greater emphasis on cooperatives within the new AID program.

Mr. Labouisse said discussions already have been held with leaders in the cooperative field in the United States regarding selection of a nongovernmental task force representing all phases of cooperative endeavor—credit, housing, agricultural marketing and supply services, and related fields—to assist with the review and development of future cooperative programs.

U.S. Makes Grant to Central American Bank for Economic Integration

Press release 418 dated June 21

The U.S. Government announced on June 21 the signing of an agreement for a grant of \$2 million by the International Cooperation Administration to the Central American Bank for Economic Integration. The grant represents a portion of \$10 million in loans and grants programmed for assistance to the Bank by the United States.

The Central American Bank for Economic Integration was established on May 30, 1961, primarily to strengthen and consolidate the Central American common market—which has been developing since 1952—and to assist in the financing of public and private projects related to the integration program. To this end, the four Central American Governments—Guatemala, El Salvador,

¹ For background, see BULLETIN of Apr. 10, 1961, p. 507; June 19, 1961, p. 947 and 977; and June 28, 1961, p. 1000.

Honduras, and Nicaragua—established the Bank with an authorized capitalization equivalent to \$16 million.

In addition to assisting in financing economic development the Bank provides technical assistance to prospective borrowers in the preparation and implementation of projects and serves also as an intermediary in obtaining credits from other financial institutions.

Membership in the Bank will be open to any other country in the area which enters into a definite commitment to participate substantially in the economic integration arrangement.

Enrique Delgado signed the agreement on behalf of the Bank as president, and D. A. FitzGerald signed for ICA.

United States Provides Afghanistan With Another 50,000 Tons of Wheat

Press release 439 dated June 23

As part of the U.S. Food-for-Peace Program, the Department of State announced on June 23 the grant of an additional 50,000 tons of American wheat to Afghanistan, bringing to 100,000 tons the total the United States has made available to this south Asian nation during the current U.S. fiscal year.

The wheat is being provided through the International Cooperation Administration under a provision of title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, which permits ICA to make food-for-peace grants of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities to help promote economic development in recipient countries.

The wheat will assist Afghanistan to continue to meet its current grain needs and at the same time provide local currency to finance needed development projects such as rural school construction and agricultural projects.

A formal agreement accepting the grain on behalf of the Government of Afghanistan was signed at Washington on June 23 by the Afghan Ambassador to the United States, Mohammed Hashim Maiwandwal, in the presence of Henry R. Labouisse, Director of ICA.

The United States will defray the ocean freight costs of shipping the grain to Karachi, Pakistan, the Arabian Sea port nearest Afghanistan, and also the cost of transshipping the grain across

Pakistan to the nearest Afghan port of entry, where it will be loaded aboard trucks for delivery in Afghanistan.

The shipments will bring to 230,000 tons the amount of wheat that the United States has provided Afghanistan at that country's request since 1957. In addition to the 50,000 tons authorized earlier this fiscal year (November 1960), other U.S. shipments included 40,000 tons each in 1957 and 1958, and 50,000 tons in 1959.

Study of ICA Health Program To Be Made by Johns Hopkins

Press release 434 dated June 23

The Department of State on June 23 announced an award of \$250,000 by the International Cooperation Administration to the Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health for special studies over the next 3 years in developing recommendations to improve the ICA international health program.

The studies will include developing new methods, techniques, and procedures for use in training personnel from overseas as well as the United States who are engaged in the health program. The findings will be available for general use.

Particular emphasis will be placed upon a trainee's needs and the needs of his country in an effort to tailor a postgraduate experience with greater local value. Pertinent studies will relate to academic instruction and field experience available in the United States, including training for U.S. personnel to work in foreign countries.

It was pointed out that foreign students are often at a disadvantage because they generally come from countries where the health professions are much less developed than in the United States. Furthermore, the foreign student may not have as good a command of the English language as his U.S. classmates.

Attempts will be made at the Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health to study these and other important problems of field training, paramedical training, refresher training for U.S. personnel in international health, etc.

The school is one of a small group in the world devoted to postgraduate study in public health. About one-third of its enrollment are students from foreign countries, and many of the American students serve abroad after graduation.

U.S. Urges Start of Serious Negotiations on Laos

Statement by W. Averell Harriman¹

During the weeks we have been meeting we have listened to a great deal of oratory, some of it factual, some of it propaganda, some of it deliberate distortion of the facts. Indeed, some of the spokesmen have taken up considerable time in this conference not in discussing constructive issues but in casting aspersions against the delegates and the governments of other countries represented at this table, including my own. Up to the present I have considered that I could leave these unanswered and not doubly burden the conference by rebuttal. However, when the day before yesterday the Soviet Foreign Minister [Andrei A. Gromyko] associated himself with these distortions and defamatory remarks, I was forced to the conclusion that I had no alternative but to set the record straight.

Soviet Distortions of the Record

The first point to which I shall address myself is that of the responsibility for the delays which this conference has experienced during the past month. I need not recall to you what has been stated by my delegation and others so many times: that it had been agreed an effective cease-fire was a prerequisite to the deliberations of this conference. The delay in this conference has been occasioned by the refusal of the Soviet cochairman to join with his British colleague to send adequate instructions to the ICC [International Control Commission] and to call upon the parties in Laos to cooperate with the Commission in investigation of alleged cease-fire violations in fulfillment of its task of supervision and control of the cease-

fire. This refusal persisted despite the fact that there were recurring allegations and complaints from both combatant parties of serious violations of the cease-fire. As Ambassador [Jean] Chauvel pointed out here the other day, if there had been the will to do so, the necessary instructions could have been drawn up in 5 minutes by almost anyone in this room.

The second distortion of the record which must be corrected concerns the question of responsibility for the recent flagrant breach of the cease-fire at Pa Dong. It has been alleged here that the cause for the Pa Dong incident was "provocation" by the forces of the Royal Lao Government and by the United States. It has been claimed that the troops stationed at Pa Dong were airdropped in that vicinity after the date of the cease-fire appeal in Laos.

The forces at Pa Dong were Royal Lao Government units under command of Colonel Van Pao. They had retreated last December from the Plaine des Jarres under rebel attack. Their headquarters were established last January at Ban Pa Dong and the troops gradually withdrew to a position along a ridge which the Pathet Lao considered militarily inconvenient. These forces were cut off from any passable overland routes to their normal supply bases. They have been under almost constant attack since May 12, as I have recorded at this conference. The only practical and effective way for them to receive food and other essential supplies has been through airlifts. The Royal Lao Government has consistently asked for an ICC investigation on the spot at Pa Dong. My Government, and I myself at this conference table, have similarly called for ICC inspection almost from the beginning of this conference. General Phoumi [Nosavan] some time ago offered to place his Pa Dong airlift under ICC supervision. How, under any system of reasoning, can this be considered a record of provocation?

Yet the Soviet delegate and the Pathet Lao have consistently refused to cooperate with proposals for an inspection on the spot by the ICC, which could report the truth to this conference. This refusal alone exposes the insincerity of the charges

¹Made before the International Conference for the Settlement of the Laotian Question at Geneva on June 15 (press release 405 dated June 16). Ambassador Harriman is chairman of the U.S. delegation to the conference. For background, see BULLETIN of May 15, 1961, p. 710; June 5, 1961, p. 844; and June 26, 1961, p. 1023.

of provocation. Far from being a response to provocation, the attack on Pa Dong was an aggressive, willful violation of the cease-fire, mounted for the specific purpose of eliminating a military position to which the Pathet Lao objected.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we have received press reports of an attack on a Royal Lao Government position north of Paksane. I wonder what sort of so-called "provocations" we can expect to have adduced in justification of this apparent breach of the cease-fire. If this reported attack results in a Royal Lao Government complaint, we assume that immediate steps will be taken to investigate and to report to this conference.

Next, in dealing with the truth concerning recent Lao history, I shall turn to the question of American military personnel in Laos. The Soviet Foreign Minister said the day before yesterday that the Royal Lao Government forces at Pa Dong were "headed by American officers." Let us look at the record. At the time of the attack on Pa Dong there were seven Americans, only one of whom was an officer—and his rank is that of captain—among the 1,400 Royal Lao Government troops in the area of Pa Dong. This team had been attached since the first part of April as advisers to Colonel Van Pao's command. No effort has been made to conceal their presence there. By contrast, among the attacking forces were at least two infantry companies of Viet Minh troops. There were also Viet Minh specialists attached to the Pathet Lao artillery and other units. There has been not only a constant denial of the presence of these forces but extensive efforts to conceal that presence from the world. The Soviet Union has been almost daily supplying the forces of the rebels through Xieng Khouang by an airlift which originates in north Viet-Nam.

Tenor of Vienna Communiqué

Finally, let me turn to the appeal which the Soviet Foreign Minister addressed to my delegation to "translate into the language of specific agreements" the substance of the Vienna communiqué.² As the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Viet-Nam [Vu Van Mau] pointed out yesterday, one of the significant passages from that communiqué, which the Soviet Foreign Minister failed to mention, specified the importance of an effective cease-fire in Laos. I should like in turn to appeal to the Soviet delegate to translate not only the sub-

stance but also the tenor of that communiqué into our deliberations here at Geneva. The communiqué was a calm, factual statement without bombast, invective, or propaganda content. In contrast, many of the speeches we have heard here have been largely propaganda. This conference will make little or no progress if it devotes itself to the constant repetition of propaganda themes. One of the most repeated and most sweeping statements that we have heard here concerns the contention that proposals for reasonable responsibility for the ICC would make it a "superstate" and would derogate from the sovereignty of Laos. These sweeping statements do not specify the precise manner in which Lao sovereignty would be infringed by the operations of the ICC. Let us all remember that the only functions which the ICC could perform under any proposals which have been made to this conference would be those of investigating, reporting, and publishing its findings. The Commission's only authority flows from the moral effect of public knowledge of the facts.

Since all of these activities would be directed toward the problem of external intervention in Lao domestic affairs, it is difficult for me to understand how any of them can limit in any sense the right of "self-determination for Laos" which the Soviet delegate contends is central to his Government's international policy.

As an American I was glad to hear that the Soviet Government's foreign policy is now based on the principle of self-determination. As the British cochairman has reason to know, this policy of self-determination has been the guiding principle of my country since 1776. Historically the United States has concentrated its greatest effort in the field of foreign policy on this ideal. We are meeting here today in a palace of nations inspired by an American President who spent the full measure of his life's vitality on this goal.

But these rhetorical references to ideals, no matter how noble or enduring they may be, will not advance us toward the conclusion of the work for which we have come to Geneva. We must find ways to reduce the decibels of our discussions from these plenary meetings to the quiet working negotiations which are necessary for progress. As the Soviet Foreign Minister is aware, both the Secretary of State and I have long since suggested that one means which the members of this conference might consider promising for our

² For text, see *ibid.*, June 26, 1961, p. 999.

work is the establishment of working groups. Such groups would permit the paragraph-by-paragraph discussion which the Soviet Foreign Minister desires.

Ever since we have been here in Geneva—and even before we arrived—my delegation has been preparing itself for such discussions by seeking out and ascertaining the views of other delegations. We have paid particular attention to those neighbors of Laos in southeast Asia who, because of their geographic location, have, in our opinion, a special and continuing interest in the future of Laos. We have studied with care both the Soviet and the French drafts. We have listened with considerable interest to the suggestions made by the distinguished delegate from India [S. Sen].

On the basis of these discussions and these studies, we are fully prepared to enter into detailed drafting work on a paragraph-by-paragraph, line-by-line, word-by-word basis.

In our opinion the proposals which have been submitted by Ambassador Chauvel are thoughtful, constructive documents which should constitute the basis for our work. We think, perhaps, that the French protocol on the International Control Commission could be made more precise and somewhat stronger in certain particulars such as voting procedure, publication of reports, and facilities afforded the investigation teams. We feel that there should be additional provisions to supplement those which it already contains. We are willing to join in such discussions in whatever form the conference may consider the most useful. There is ample work here to keep all of us busy and to command the most exacting degree of our attention. Let us turn to that work in a workmanlike manner. So long as we are free from military threats and from bombast, either here or in Laos, there is every reason to hope that our work can bring useful results.

Seating Legal Government of Laos

However, before we can actually bring that work to a conclusion and produce a set of documents which will embody the product of our labors, we must be joined by the legal Government of Laos. In this connection I should like to quote from the statement made by the head of my delegation, the Secretary of State, on May 17. He said:³

³ *Ibid.*, June 5, 1961, p. 844.

We do not believe that this conference is properly constituted without due provision for the delegates of the constitutional government of Laos. The Royal Lao Government, empowered by the King and Parliament to govern Laos, represents that country in the United Nations and in other international bodies. It is the only authority resting upon that nation's constitution and the means established by law for registering the wishes of the King and people. We do not see how we can make good progress without the presence here of the Government of Laos, and we regret, though understand, why it does not consider that it can be here under existing circumstances. We believe that this, too, is a matter which requires the immediate attention of the cochairmen in order that this conference of governments may have the benefit of the participation of the Government of the very country which we are discussing.

In the spirit of this quotation I should like to register my sympathy with the point of order raised by the distinguished delegate of Thailand [Konthi Suphamongkhon] on this matter of Lao-tian seating. It is not right for us to sit here discussing matters of such vital concern to the Government of Laos in the absence of its representatives. I would therefore urge the cochairmen, as my Secretary of State has done before me, to take the initiative and consult with the representatives of the Royal Lao Government in order to determine whether satisfactory seating arrangements can be worked out with them in order to enable them to join us here in these deliberations. I am encouraged to hope that such an initiative on the part of the cochairmen, taken at a time when the three princes are about to begin their meeting in the nearby city of Zurich, might eliminate this unfortunate situation and enable us to move forward in the confidence that our work in this room will proceed to the benefit of all the Lao people.

President Approves Research Grant to Pan American Sanitary Bureau

White House press release dated June 12

The President on June 12 approved a grant of \$120,750 by the Public Health Service to expand the capacity of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau to plan, organize, and develop international medical research projects for the Americas. PASB, as the regional office of the World Health Organization, is the oldest international health agency and has had extensive experience in organizing public health programs related to many

countries, whereas its research experience has been more limited. There are special environmental factors peculiar to the geographic and climatic condition of Latin America which should provide opportunities for useful research. With this grant the Pan American Sanitary Bureau will establish a special medical research planning office which will assist in planning collaborative research projects throughout the Americas. This planning office will identify existing research resources and programs in Latin America and develop research projects in areas of medicine most in need of study.

In approving this grant the President has exercised his authority under the International Health Research Act of 1960—the so-called Health for Peace Act. It is a tangible expression of the intention of this country to contribute to the Alliance for Progress in the Western Hemisphere, proposed by the President.¹

In his letter to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, approving the grant, the President said, “. . . this grant will permit a substantial advance in the cooperative endeavor of the American States in the field of medical and health research.”

Security Council Calls for Prompt Report on Angola

STATEMENT BY CHARLES W. YOST²

When the problem of Angola was first brought before the Security Council in March of this year,³ the United States supported the draft resolution which was cosponsored by Ceylon, Liberia, and the United Arab Republic. This resolution would have established a subcommittee for the purpose of reporting on actual conditions in Angola as well as measures being taken by Portugal to foster the political, economic, and social progress of the

people of Angola. Since reports concerning actual conditions in Angola were fragmentary, and in certain cases contradictory, the United States considered the appointment of an impartial factfinding subcommittee as a useful first step.

In addition to supporting the three-power resolution, Ambassador Stevenson deplored the loss of life which, according to reports, had involved all segments of the community and which also served to make constructive efforts toward a solution of the basic problem more difficult. It was our hope that the proposed resolution would result in an end to violence and would serve to facilitate peaceful change. This draft resolution, however, failed of adoption.

For the reasons I have given, the United States supported in the General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV), adopted by overwhelming vote, which was essentially the same as the three-power resolution which failed of adoption in the Security Council. Subsequently a distinguished subcommittee was appointed, consisting of representatives of Bolivia, Dahomey, Finland, Malaya, and Sudan, for the purpose of examining statements made before the Assembly on Angola, receiving further statements and documents, and conducting such inquiries as the subcommittee may deem necessary in order to report to the General Assembly as soon as possible.

Meanwhile, however, there have been a further deterioration of the situation in Angola and further heavy losses of life which we continue to deplore most profoundly, which have given rise to this meeting of the Council, and which make even more urgent and necessary the work of the subcommittee.

Premier Salazar, in a press interview published May 31, which has already been quoted here, stated his intention to introduce political, economic, and social reforms in Portugal's overseas territories, steps which will accelerate progress toward self-government. We view this statement as an encouraging development and would hope that concrete steps will be taken by the Portuguese Government in the immediate future. We believe Portugal should be given a certain time to announce and to carry out concrete reforms in the direction which Premier Salazar has forecast. One of our objectives in the Council should be to bring about a situation—including the cessation of bloodshed—in which such steps can be most ef-

¹ BULLETIN of Apr. 3, 1961, p. 471.

² Made in the Security Council on June 9 (U.S./U.N. press release 3730). Mr. Yost is Deputy U.S. Representative in the Security Council.

³ BULLETIN of Apr. 3, 1961, p. 497.

fectively encouraged and taken. We hope that at least in those areas not disrupted by violence political, economic, and social reforms will be commenced without delay.

If the Security Council is to exercise its role most effectively in the interests of the people of Angola, it must do so, in our opinion, in a constructive spirit and not one of recrimination. We feel that this is in fact the attitude which most Council members have adopted. The establishment of a climate which would foster self-determination in Angola depends on the cooperation of all concerned. On the one hand, a lack of political progress is an invitation to armed action. On the other hand, the contrary may also prove to be true. The continuation of violence, we feel, is more likely to delay than encourage political progress. The task of the Security Council surely must be both to produce progress and to do so peacefully. Finally, it behooves all states to discourage rather than condone or encourage violence as some have done.

We hope that all members of the United Nations, including Portugal, will cooperate with the subcommittee in an effort to determine the facts about conditions in Angola. We are confident that the subcommittee will present an impartial report, thus making a genuine contribution toward a peaceful solution.

It is in this spirit that we approach the resolution contained in document S/4828. Frankly, the United States would have preferred several changes in the present text. In particular, we are anxious that this session should not do anything which would appear to prejudge the work of the General Assembly subcommittee, which was established explicitly in order to report on the facts of the situation in Angola. We will support the amendments submitted by the distinguished representative of Chile.⁴ In particular, we welcome the paragraph calling for a peaceful solution in accordance with the charter. We also feel that the change in the preamble more accurately reflects the actual situation. We will also support the resolution presented by the distinguished representatives of Liberia, the United Arab Republic, and Ceylon [S/4828], as so amended, in the hope that the adoption of this resolution will

contribute to the peaceful and constructive solution which we so earnestly desire.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION¹

The Security Council,
Having considered the situation in Angola,
Deeply deploring the large-scale killings and the severely repressive measures in Angola,

Taking note of the grave concern and strong reactions to such occurrences throughout the continent of Africa and in other parts of the world,

Convinced that the continuance of the situation in Angola is an actual and potential cause of international friction and is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV) of 15 December 1960 declaring Angola among others a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter as well as General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, by which the General Assembly declared without dissent that the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation and asked for immediate steps to be taken to transfer all powers to the peoples of these Territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom,

1. *Reaffirms* General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV) and calls upon Portugal to act in accordance with the terms of that resolution;

2. *Requests* the Sub-Committee appointed in terms of the aforesaid General Assembly resolution to implement its mandate without delay;

3. *Calls upon* the Portuguese authorities to desist forthwith from repressive measures and further to extend every facility to the Sub-Committee to enable it to perform its task expeditiously;

4. *Expresses* the hope that a peaceful solution will be found to the problem of Angola in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations;

5. *Requests* the Sub-Committee to report to the Security Council and the General Assembly as soon as possible.

¹ U.N. doc. S/4835 (S/4828 as amended by S/4833/Rev. 1); adopted by the Council on June 9 by a vote of 9 to 0, with 2 abstentions (France, U.K.). A Soviet amendment (S/4834) calling for the insertion at the beginning of operative paragraph 3 of the phrase "Condemning the colonial war against the Angolan people" failed of adoption by a vote of 4 (Ceylon, Liberia, U.S.S.R., U.A.R.) to 3 (Turkey, U.K., U.S.), with 4 abstentions (Chile, China, Ecuador, France).

⁴ U.N. doc. S/4833/Rev. 1.

Textile-Consuming Nations Meet, Propose International Consultations

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

Press release 425 dated June 21

Informal meetings began on June 21 in the Department of State between the United States and seven textile-consuming countries. The Executive Secretary of the GATT and representatives of the EEC Commission are also taking part.

The meetings are being held to discuss approaches to international trade problems in cotton textiles. They are part of the preparatory work for multilateral consultation between major importing and exporting countries to consider ways of providing a basis for expanding trade that will avoid undue disruption of established industries. The meetings will continue through June 23.

Delegates are as follows:

Belgium: Willy van Cauwenberg, Economic Minister, Embassy of Belgium

Canada: S. S. Reisman, Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Finance

France: Jean Wahl, Deputy Director of Foreign Economic Relations, Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs

Germany: Benno Buenger, Regional Director, Textiles Department, Ministry of Economics

Italy: Sergio Parboni, Deputy Director General of Foreign Trade, Ministry of Foreign Trade

Netherlands: Dr. G. H. J. Abeln, Director of Trade, Ministry of Economic Affairs

United Kingdom: Cyril Sanders, Undersecretary, Board of Trade

United States: George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs

GATT Secretariat: Eric Wyndham White, Executive Secretary

EEC Commission: Wolfgang Ernst, Director for Commercial Policy, Directorate General for External Relations

JOINT STATEMENT

Press release 440 dated June 23

Informal meetings between the United States and Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom, which began Wednesday morning [June 21] to discuss approaches to international trade problems in cotton textiles were concluded today [June 23].

The Executive Secretary of the GATT and representatives of the EEC Commission also took part.

In pursuance of the resolution of the GATT Council on June 16, 1961, the countries represented at this week's meeting proposed that there be convened in July an international meeting of countries with a direct major interest in international trade in cotton textiles, whether as exporters or importers, for the following purposes:

1. To meet the immediate problem through international action designed, at the same time,

(a) to significantly increase access to markets which are at present subject to import restrictions,

(b) to maintain orderly access to markets where restrictions are not at present maintained, and

(c) to secure from exporting countries a measure of restraint in their export policy so as to avoid disruptive effects in import markets.

2. To lay down general guiding principles to be followed and to establish international machinery for keeping the situation under review and for moving through cooperative action towards the achievement of the above purposes.

W. M. Christopher To Represent U.S. in Textile Agreement Negotiations

The Department of State announced on June 23 (press release 442) the appointment of Warren M. Christopher to represent the United States in negotiations for a multilateral textile agreement as part of the President's seven-point program of assistance to the U.S. textile industry.¹

Mr. Christopher participated in informal textile meetings held in the Department June 21-23.

United States Delegations to International Conferences

ECE Housing Committee

The Department of State announced on June 12 (press release 388) that Dan R. Hamady, Assistant Administrator, Office of International Housing, Housing and Home Finance Agency, would serve as U.S. delegate to the 21st session of the

¹ BULLETIN of May 29, 1961, p. 825.

Housing Committee of the U.N. Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), which was held at Geneva June 12-14.

Advisers to the delegation included:

Roy J. Burroughs, Director, Division of International Organizations Affairs, Office of International Housing, Housing and Home Finance Agency

Zachary Fisher, Fisher Brothers, New York, N.Y.

James H. Scheuer, President, Renewal and Development Corporation, New York, N.Y.

Howard J. Wharton, Assistant Commissioner for Redevelopment, Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency

The session of the Committee considered, among other things, the economic aspects of housing policy, town and country planning, and housing problems of countries in the course of industrialization.

TREATY INFORMATION

Antarctic Treaty Enters Into Force

Statement by President Kennedy

White House press release dated June 23

I wish to express my profound satisfaction on the occasion of the entry into force today of the Antarctic Treaty. This treaty has now been ratified by all of the 12 countries which participated in the Conference on Antarctica held in Washington in 1959—Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Chile, France, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States—all of which signed the treaty at the conclusion of the conference on December 1, 1959.¹

This is a significant treaty in several respects. First and foremost it provides that the vast Antarctic Continent shall be used for peaceful purposes only. Accompanying this provision is the important provision whereby the parties have the right to send observers anywhere in Antarctica at any time to see that the treaty is not being violated, and the right of overflight of all areas of Antarctica. It could very well provide valuable

¹ For background and text of treaty, see BULLETIN of Dec. 21, 1959, p. 911.

practical experience in the field of international inspection in other situations.

The treaty also provides for freedom of scientific investigation and international cooperation in science in Antarctica. Nuclear explosions throughout the area are banned, pending general international agreement on the subject, although the use of nuclear energy for such purposes as heat and power is permitted.

The difficult question of territorial claims in Antarctica is in effect set aside by the treaty, which states that nothing in the treaty shall be interpreted as either a renunciation or recognition of claims or bases of claims. The United States has never asserted a territorial claim in Antarctica, nor has it ever recognized the claims of others. By this treaty the United States continues to reserve its rights throughout the whole of Antarctica.

The Antarctic Treaty was conceived by the United States, and the conference at which it was drawn up was called by the United States after nearly 2 years of patient and skillful preliminary negotiations. It has been signed and ratified by countries representing all of the world's six continents, many of which held divergent views on Antarctica. That this was possible I find very encouraging.

I earnestly believe that the Antarctic Treaty represents a positive step in the direction of worldwide peace and am genuinely gratified to announce its entry into force today [June 23].

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Antarctica

The Antarctic Treaty. Signed at Washington December 1, 1959.

Ratifications deposited: Argentina, Australia, and Chile, June 23, 1961.

Entered into force: June 23, 1961.

Automotive Traffic

Convention on road traffic, with annexes. Done at Geneva September 19, 1949. Entered into force March 26, 1952. TIAS 2487.

Application to: Hong Kong, January 12, 1961.

Copyright

Universal copyright convention. Done at Geneva September 6, 1952. Entered into force September 16, 1955. TIAS 3324.

Ratification deposited: Nicaragua, May 16, 1961.

Protocol 1 to the universal copyright convention concerning the application of that convention to the works of stateless persons and refugees. Done at Geneva September 6, 1952. Entered into force September 16, 1955. TIAS 3324.

Ratification deposited: Nicaragua, May 16, 1961.

Protocol 2 to the universal copyright convention concerning the application of that convention to the works of certain international organizations. Done at Geneva September 6, 1952. Entered into force September 16, 1955. TIAS 3324.

Ratification deposited: Nicaragua, May 16, 1961.

Protocol 3 to the universal copyright convention concerning the effective date of instruments of ratification or acceptance of or accession to that convention. Done at Geneva September 6, 1952. Entered into force August 19, 1954. TIAS 3324.

Ratification deposited: Nicaragua, May 16, 1961.

Cultural Property

Protocol for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict. Done at The Hague May 14, 1954. Entered into force August 7, 1956.¹

Ratification deposited: Ecuador, February 8, 1961.

Narcotics

Protocol bringing under international control drugs outside the scope of the convention limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs concluded at Geneva July 13, 1931 (48 Stat. 1543), as amended (61 Stat. 2230; 62 Stat. 1796). Done at Paris November 19, 1948. Entered into force December 1, 1949. TIAS 2308.

Acceptance deposited: Liechtenstein, May 24, 1961.

Protocol for limiting and regulating the cultivation of the poppy plant, the production of, international and wholesale trade in, and use of opium. Dated at New York June 23, 1953.²

Ratification deposited: Liechtenstein, May 24, 1961.

Wheat

International wheat agreement, 1959, with annex. Opened for signature at Washington April 6 through 24, 1959. Entered into force July 16, 1959, for part I and parts III to VIII, and August 1, 1959, for part II. TIAS 4302.

Accession deposited: Nigeria, June 16, 1961.

BILATERAL

Brazil

Treaty of extradition. Signed at Rio de Janeiro January 13, 1961.²

Ratified by President of the United States: May 29, 1961.

Canada

Agreement for improving the air defense of the Canada-United States region of NATO, for furthering the defense production sharing program and for the provision of assistance to certain other NATO governments. Effected by exchange of notes at Ottawa June 12, 1961. Entered into force June 12, 1961.

Denmark

Treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation, with protocol and minutes of interpretation. Signed at Copenhagen October 1, 1951.²

Ratified by President of the United States: May 29, 1961.

¹ Not in force for the United States.

² Not in force.

Inter-American Development Bank

Social progress trust fund agreement, and exchange of letters. Signed at Washington June 19, 1961. Entered into force June 19, 1961.

Iran

Agreement amending the surplus agricultural commodities agreement of July 26, 1960, with exchanges of notes July 26 and 28, 1960 (TIAS 4544), as amended (TIAS 4592, 4598, and 4719). Effected by exchange of notes at Tehran May 18 and June 1, 1961. Entered into force June 1, 1961.

Japan

Agreement for the establishment of a Joint United States-Japan Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington June 22, 1961. Entered into force June 22, 1961.

Mexico

Agreement concerning radio broadcasting in the standard broadcast band, and six annexes. Signed at Mexico January 29, 1957. Entered into force June 9, 1961.

Proclaimed by President of the United States: June 16, 1961.

Netherlands Antilles

Agreement for the exchange of international money orders. Signed at Willemstad December 20, 1960, and at Washington January 11, 1961. Entered into force May 1, 1961.

Niger

Agreement providing for the furnishing of economic, technical and related assistance. Effected by exchange of notes at Niamey May 26, 1961. Entered into force May 26, 1961.

Pakistan

Agreement amending the surplus agricultural commodities agreement of April 11, 1960 (TIAS 4470), as amended (TIAS 4579, 4720, and 4743). Effected by exchange of notes at Karachi June 3, 1961. Entered into force June 3, 1961.

Upper Volta

Agreement providing for the furnishing of economic, technical and related assistance. Effected by exchange of notes at Ouagadougou June 1, 1961. Entered into force June 1, 1961.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Second Exchange of Key Personnel With Defense Department Begins

The Department of State announced on June 13 (press release 391) that the second group of personnel exchanges between the Department of State and the Department of Defense had been honored in a ceremony that day in the office of the Deputy Secretary of Defense. Chester Bowles, Under Secretary of State, and Roswell L. Gilpatric, Deputy Secretary of Defense, con-

Department of State Bulletin

ducted the ceremony. The senior representatives of both Departments also participated in the ceremony.

The program to exchange outstanding civilian and military key personnel for training assignments in selected positions of each Department was initiated January 9, 1961.¹ In the first group five Foreign Service officers were placed in Army, Navy, Air Force, the Joint Staff, and Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), respectively, and individuals from these organizations were assigned to various bureaus in the State Department.

This interchange of personnel is designed to promote a better understanding of foreign affairs and military problems and a continuing development of personnel in both Departments in areas where foreign policy and military policy coincide. The men loaned will function as an integral part of the host agency.

The personnel are nominated for their qualifications in high-level policy and command and staff duties. In the selections, particular emphasis is placed on educational background, future potential, skill, past training, experience, and the ability to meet the requirements of the position to which assigned. Assignments will be for a period of approximately 2 years.

At the June 13 ceremony the personnel to be exchanged from each Department were congratulated on their selection by Mr. Bowles and Mr. Gilpatrick.

The following nominees have been selected for the second exchange.

From Defense

Col. William R. Sturges, Jr., USAF, from Office of Director, Defense Research and Engineering, to Office of Science Adviser

Lt. Col. DeWitt C. Armstrong III, USA, from Department of the Army to Office of British Commonwealth and Northern European Affairs

Capt. George Sharp, USN, from Department of the Navy to Office of Inter-American Regional Political Affairs

Col. William B. Robinson, USAF, from Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs) to Politico-Military Staff, Deputy Under Secretary for Political Affairs

Clarence Grant Shaw, from Office of Secretary of Defense to Division of Communications Services, Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Operations

Col. Leslie B. Williams, USAF, from Department of the Air Force to Office of Special Assistant to the Secretary for Atomic Energy and Outer Space

¹ BULLETIN of Jan. 30, 1961, p. 169.

Lynford A. Lardner, from Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs) to an assignment to be determined

From State

William T. Briggs, from National War College to Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Western Hemisphere Regional Office
James R. Ruchti, from Bureau of African Affairs to Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower)

Robert L. Burns, from Office of Coordinator for Mutual Security to Office of Director for Research and Engineering

James J. Blake, from Industrial College of the Armed Forces to Office of Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, Department of the Army, Strategic Plans and Policy (International and Policy Division)

Theodore A. Tremblay, from Bureau of Intelligence and Research to Office of Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Plans and Policy), Strategic Plans Division

Ellwood Rabenold, from Air War College to Department of the Air Force, Directorate of Plans

William B. Dunham, from U.S. Embassy, The Hague, to Department of the Navy, Political-Military Affairs

Mr. Ball Appointed to Board of Panama Canal Company

The Department of State announced on June 22 (press release 430) that Under Secretary Ball would be sworn in on June 23 as a member of the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Co.

This appointment is the result of a determination made by President Eisenhower in September 1960 following an agreement by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of State that the Department of State should be represented on the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Co. at the Under Secretary level. Secretary of the Army Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., appointed Mr. Ball on May 31, 1961, after he had been nominated by Secretary of State Rusk.

Confirmations

The Senate on June 13 confirmed the following nominations:

Henry DeWolf Smyth to be U.S. Representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 397 dated June 15.)

William I. Cargo to be Deputy U.S. Representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 400 dated June 15.)

Appointments

Donald L. Daughters as Director, U.S. Operations Mission, Ecuador, effective June 19. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 417 dated June 21.)

Ernest K. Lindley as Special Assistant to the Secretary and member of the Policy Planning Council, effective June 19. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 411 dated June 19.)

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

The Newly Independent Nations—

Morocco. Pub. 7126. African Series 8. 10 pp. 10¢.

Tunisia. Pub. 7150. African Series 11. 10 pp. 10¢.

Leaflets, in a series of fact sheets, designed to give readers a few highlights on the peoples and lands of the newly independent nations.

Your Department of State. Pub. 7168. Department and Foreign Service Series 99. 16 pp. 15¢.

This pamphlet reviews briefly the history, functions, and organization of the Department of State.

Mutual Defense Assistance. TIAS 4661. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement with Belgium, amending Annex B to the agreement of January 27, 1950. Exchange of notes—Signed at Brussels December 1 and 23, 1960. Entered into force December 23, 1960.

Defense, Loans of Additional Vessels. TIAS 4662. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement with Brazil. Exchange of notes—Signed at Rio de Janeiro November 21 and December 27, 1960. Entered into force December 27, 1960. And signed at Rio de Janeiro December 28 and 29, 1960. Entered into force December 29, 1960.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4663. 12 pp. 10¢.

Agreement with Chile—Signed at Santiago November 8, 1960. Entered into force November 8, 1960. With memorandum of understanding and exchange of notes.

Economic Cooperation: Application to Territories Under Jurisdiction of The West Indies Government. TIAS 4664. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, amending the agreement of July 6, 1948, as amended. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington June 26 and August 20, 1959. Entered into force August 20, 1959.

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: June 19-25

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of News, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Releases issued prior to June 19 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 372 of June 8, 375 and 380 of June 9, 391 of June 13, 390 and 396 of June 14, and 405 of June 16.

No.	Date	Subject
*409	6/19	U.S. participation in international conferences.
†410	6/19	Ball: Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments.
*411	6/19	Lindley appointment (biographic details).
*412	6/19	New members of Advisory Committee on Educational Exchange (biographic details).
*413	6/19	Cultural exchange (Finland).
*414	6/19	Cultural exchange.
*415	6/20	U.S. memorandum on Nacvalac case.
*416	6/20	Akers sworn in as Ambassador to New Zealand (biographic details).
*417	6/21	Daughters sworn in as Director, USOM, Ecuador (biographic details).
418	6/21	Grant to Central American Bank.
†419	6/21	Williams: Operation Crossroads, Africa.
*420	6/21	Moyer retires as Director, USOM, Korea (biographic details).
421	6/21	U.S. note on Nacvalac case.
*422	6/21	Stephansky sworn in as Ambassador to Bolivia (biographic details).
*423	6/21	Cultural exchange (Cyprus).
*424	6/21	Amendments to Ikeda visit.
425	6/21	Meeting of textile-consuming nations.
426	6/22	Aid to Zanzibar refugees.
†427	6/22	Sisco: "A New Look at the U.N.: Political Assessment of the Organization for the Decade of the Sixties."
428	6/22	Rusk: news conference.
429	6/22	Exchange of notes on U.S.-Japan Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs.
430	6/22	Ball appointed to board of Panama Canal Co. (rewrite).
431	6/22	Spain waives right to have two naval deserters returned.
432	6/23	Cooperatives stressed in foreign aid program.
433	6/23	Stevenson: return from South America.
434	6/23	Research grant to Johns Hopkins.
†435	6/23	Economic mission to Thailand (rewrite).
436	6/23	Travel of Hungarian officials.
*437	6/24	Rowan: "New Frontiers in Race Relations."
†438	6/23	Martin: reduction of customs exemption for U.S. tourists.
439	6/23	Wheat to Afghanistan.
440	6/23	Meeting of textile-consuming nations.
†441	6/23	Aviation talks with Canada.
442	6/23	Christopher appointed U.S. representative to textile negotiations (rewrite).

* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

Afghanistan. United States Provides Afghanistan With Another 50,000 Tons of Wheat	84	Italy. U.S. and Italy Reaffirm Common Aim of Promoting Peace and Progress (text of joint communique)	60
Africa. A New Generation and the Future of Africa (Williams)	72	Japan	
American Principles. Our Changing World (Bohlen)	62	Prime Minister of Japan Concludes Official Visit to Washington (texts of joint communique and exchange of notes)	57
American Republics		Secretary Rusk's News Conference of June 22	51
Ambassador Stevenson Returns From Visit to South America	61	Laos. U.S. Urges Start of Serious Negotiations on Laos (Harriman)	85
A New Birth of Freedom (Farland)	75	Mutual Security	
President Approves Research Grant to Pan American Sanitary Bureau	87	Daughters appointed as USOM Director, Ecuador	94
Secretary Rusk's News Conference of June 22	51	New Foreign Aid Program To Place Greater Emphasis on Cooperatives	83
U.S. Makes Grant to Central American Bank for Economic Integration	83	Secretary Rusk's News Conference of June 22	51
Angola. Security Council Calls for Prompt Report on Angola (Yost, text of resolution)	88	Study of ICA Health Program To Be Made by Johns Hopkins	84
Antarctica. Antarctic Treaty Enters Into Force (Kennedy)	91	U.S. Aids Zanzibar Refugees	71
Communism		U.S. Makes Grant to Central American Bank for Economic Integration	83
A New Birth of Freedom (Farland)	75	United States Provides Afghanistan With Another 50,000 Tons of Wheat	84
Our Changing World (Bohlen)	62	Non-Self-Governing Territories	
Congress, The. Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy	75	Security Council Calls for Prompt Report on Angola (Yost, text of resolution)	88
Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovak U.N. Official Violates Status; U.S. Requests Departure (texts of U.S. notes)	66	U.S. Aids Zanzibar Refugees	71
Department and Foreign Service		Presidential Documents	
Appointments (Daughters, Lindley)	94	Antarctic Treaty Enters Into Force	91
Mr. Ball Appointed to Board of Panama Canal Company	93	Immigration Quota Established for Sierra Leone	74
Confirmations (Cargo, Smyth)	93	Prime Minister of Japan Concludes Official Visit to Washington	57
Second Exchange of Key Personnel With Defense Department Begins	92	U.S. and Italy Reaffirm Common Aim of Promoting Peace and Progress	60
Disarmament		Publications. Recent Releases	94
Secretary Rusk's News Conference of June 22	51	Sierra Leone. Immigration Quota Established for Sierra Leone (text of proclamation)	74
U.S., U.S.S.R. Discuss Framework and Forum for Disarmament Talks (text of joint communique)	57	Spain. Spain Waives Right to Have Two Naval Deserters Returned	71
Economic Affairs		Treaty Information	
Textile-Consuming Nations Meet, Propose International Consultations (text of joint statement)	90	Antarctic Treaty Enters Into Force (Kennedy)	91
U.S. Makes Grant to Central American Bank for Economic Integration	83	Current Actions	91
Ecuador. Daughters appointed USOM Director	94	U.S.S.R.	
Educational and Cultural Affairs		Secretary Rusk's News Conference of June 22	51
A New Generation and the Future of Africa (Williams)	72	U.S., U.S.S.R. Discuss Framework and Forum for Disarmament Talks (text of joint communique)	57
Two New Members of Commission on Educational Exchange Confirmed	59	United Nations	
Germany. Secretary Rusk's News Conference of June 22	51	Czechoslovak U.N. Official Violates Status; U.S. Requests Departure (texts of U.S. notes)	66
Hungary. U.S. Changes Procedures Governing Travel of Hungarian Officials	67	Security Council Calls for Prompt Report on Angola (Yost, text of resolution)	88
Immigration and Naturalization. Immigration Quota Established for Sierra Leone (text of proclamation)	74	The United Nations, First Step Toward a World Under Law (Stevenson)	68
Quota Established for Sierra Leone (a proclamation)	74		
International Organizations and Conferences		Name Index	
ECE Housing Committee (delegation)	90	Adams, Walter	59
President Approves Research Grant to Pan American Sanitary Bureau	87	Ball, George W	93
Smyth and Cargo confirmed to IAEA	93	Bohlen, Charles E	62
Textile-Consuming Nations Meet, Propose International Consultations (text of joint statement)	90	Cargo, William I	93
U.S. Urges Start of Serious Negotiations on Laos (Harriman)	85	Daughters, Donald L	94
W. M. Christopher To Represent U.S. in Textile Agreement Negotiations	90	Fanfan, Amintore	60
		Farland, Joseph S	75
		Harriman, W. Averell	85
		Ikeda, Hayato	57
		Kennedy, President	57, 60, 91
		Kosaka, Zentaro	57
		Lindley, Ernest K	94
		Rusk, Secretary	51, 57
		Smyth, Henry DeWolf	93
		Smyth, Mabel M	59
		Stevenson, Adlai E	61, 68
		Williams, G. Mennen	72
		Yost, Charles W	88

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INC
EDITORIAL DEPT
313 N FIRST ST
ANN ARBOR, MICH
DSB-DEC

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)



the
Department
of
State

THE NEWLY INDEPENDENT NATIONS

Following are the latest in the new series of Department of State leaflets designed to give readers a few highlights on the peoples and the lands which make up these nations:

	<u>Pub. No.</u>	<u>Price</u>
Burma	7114	10 cents
Cambodia	7040	5 cents
Ghana	7076	10 cents
Guinea	7069	5 cents
Indonesia	7117	15 cents
Malagasy	7123	5 cents
Morocco	7126	10 cents
Nigeria	7121	5 cents
Togo	7135	10 cents

HIGHLIGHTS OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S NEW ACT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

This pamphlet summarizes the international development program and contains the statement made by the Secretary of State before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in support of the Act for International Development and the International Peace and Security Act.

Publication No. 7211

20 cents

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ _____
(cash, check, or money
order payable to
Supt. of Docs.)

Please send me _____ copies of leaflets for the following countries

☐ Highlights of President Kennedy's New Act for International Development

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____

